National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. | Without Concealment---Without Compromise. | EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } Corresponding Editors.

VOL. X.---NO. 45. | NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 1850. | WHOLE NUMBER 513.

Published Weekly,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY,
AT 112 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK.

Terms,
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. Gay, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. Gay, New-York.

NORRIS, PRINTER.

Selections.

SPEECH
OF
MR. THADDEUS STEVENS,
OF PENNSYLVANIA,

In the House of Representatives, on the reference of the President's annual Message—made in Committee of the Whole, February 20, 1850.

Mr. Stevens, of Pennsylvania, said:

Mr. Chairman—I do not know that I should have troubled the committee at this time, could I see any reasonable prospect that the House would devote its time to practical legislation. But, for a considerable time after our meeting, the organization of the House was obstructed; and, since organized, a large portion of its time has been occupied by speeches on the subject of Slavery, mostly by southern gentlemen, when no practical question, to which they could apply, was before the committee. There was no doubt a well-defined object in this, partly to intimidate Congress, and partly to occupy its time, so that no legislation could be matured obnoxious to southern gentlemen. Indeed we are not left to conjecture on this point. The learned gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. Clingman,] who was selected to open the debate in behalf of human bondage, distinctly notified us, that unless Congress, as a condition precedent, submitted to settle the Slavery question, according to southern demands, there should be no legislation, even to the passage of the ordinary appropriation bills necessary to sustain the government; and that such measures would not be obstructed by meeting them in manly debate, and voting on their merits, but by incessantly calling the yeas and nays, on repeated and frivolous motions to adjourn, until the end of the session. Sir, I doubt not that, before he ventured on so high a threat, he had full assurances from a sufficient number of southern gentlemen to carry it into effect. For, if he had made it upon his own bare authority, it would degenerate into contemptible gasconade, which I am sure that discreet gentleman would not indulge in. The scenes of last Monday in this House fully sustain him, and showed that they had the will and the power to execute it.

Here, then, we have a well-defined and palpable conspiracy of southern members, combined to stop the necessary supplies to the existence of the government, disorganize and dissolve it, until the bands that bind the Union together are severed, and, as a gentleman early in the session desired, "discord reigns." Well might the gentleman anticipate that the country and posterity would pronounce this treason, rank treason against the nation! Sir, I doubt if there is another legislative body in the world where such sedition would not be followed by prosecution and punishment. France has lately exiled members of her assembly for a similar offence. But in this glorious country, where nearly two-thirds of the people are free, we can say anything within these walls or behind them with impunity, unless it be to agitate in favor of human liberty—that is aggression!

Let us inquire, what is the grave offence, the mighty wrong, which can justify a threat big with such portentous consequences? The refusal of Congress to propagate or to establish a doubtful or even an admitted good in the Territories would surely be no cause for rebellion and revolution—much less would the refusal to extend an evil, an admitted evil, an unmitigated wrong. Will an intelligent and free posterity believe it, when impartial history records that the only cause for this high threat was the apprehension that the Congress of this *free* Republic would not propagate, nor permit to be propagated, the institution of human Slavery into her vast Territories now free? Yet such is the simple fact. It is proper, then, to inquire whether the thing sought to be forced upon the Territories at the risk of treason and rebellion be a good or an evil. I think it is a great evil, which ought to be interdicted; that we should oppose it as statesmen, as philanthropists, and as moralists, notwithstanding the extraordinary position taken by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Hilliard) to the contrary.

While I thus announce my unchangeable hostility to Slavery in every form and in every place, I also avow my determination to stand by all the compromises of the constitution, and to carry them into faithful effect. Some of those compromises I greatly dislike; and, were they now open for consideration, they should never receive my assent. But I find them in a constitution formed in difficult times, and I would not disturb them.

By those compromises Congress has no power over Slavery in the States. I greatly regret that it is so; for, if it were within our legitimate control, I would go, regardless of all threats, for some just, safe, and certain means for its final extinction. But I know of no one who claims the right, or desires to touch it within the States. But when we come to form governments for territories acquired long since the formation of the constitution, and to admit new States, whose only claim for admission depends on the will of Congress, we are bound so to discharge that duty as shall best contribute to the prosperity, the power, the permanency, and the glory of this nation. Does Slavery contribute to either of these? Is it not rather subversive of them all? Let us first view it in the low light of political economy. That nation, I suppose, is always the most prosperous, all other things being equal, that has the most industrious, and the largest number of the producing classes. Those who merely consume the fruits of the earth, add nothing to the strength or wealth of a nation. Slave countries never can have a large number of industrious freemen. Slaveholders form an untilled aristocracy, with numerous dependents. Individuals appropriate large tracts of territory to themselves, and thus prevent it from being thickly settled by freemen. Their laborers, having no ambition to gratify, no love of gain to stimulate them, no parental feelings to impel them to action, are idle and wasteful. When the lash is the only stimulant, the spirit of man revolts from labor.

That the Republic must be feeble, both in peace and war, that has not an intelligent and industrious yeomanry equally removed from luxury and from poverty. The middling classes, who own the soil, and work it with their own hands, are the main support of every free government. Despotism may be powerful, and long sustained by a mixed population of serfs and nobles. But free representative Republics, that rely upon the voluntary action of the people, never can. Under such governments, those who defend and support the country, must have a stake in the soil; must have interests to protect and rights to defend.

Slave countries never can have such a yeomanry: never can have a body of small proprietors who own the soil and till it with their own hands, and sit down in conscious independence under their own vine and fig tree. There, there is no sound connecting link between the aristocrat and the slave. True, there is a class of human beings between them; but they are the most worthless and miserable of mankind. The poor white laborer is the scorn of the slave himself; for Slavery always degrades labor. The white people who work with their hands are ranked with the other laborers—the slaves. They are excluded from the society of the rich. Their associates, if anywhere, are with the colored population. They feel that they are degraded and despised; and their minds and conduct generally conform to their condition.

The soil occupied by Slavery is much less productive than a similar soil occupied by freemen. Men who are to receive none of the wages of their labor do not care to multiply its fruit. Sloth, negligence, improvidence, are the consequence. The land being neglected, becomes poor and barren; as it becomes exhausted, it is thrown out as waste, for slave labor never renovates its strength. This applies particularly to agricultural States. Take Virginia, the favorite example for the south, which has been so triumphantly referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. Clingman.] Whence he drew his facts that she was more prosperous, more populous, and more rich, than the free States, I know not. I am sure it was not from personal observation. He would not certainly draw on his imagination in matters of fact. I suppose he must have been misled by the most miserable of sophists, and most false of chroniclers, Ellwood Fisher.

I admit that, by nature, Virginia has capabilities—equal, if not superior, to any State in the Union. She has a delightful climate; a soil naturally fertile. She is intersected, as well said by the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Bayly,) by the noblest rivers. Her hills and mountains are filled with rich minerals and covered with valuable timber. She has the finest water-power, I believe, in the nation, in the very heart of her State; and her harbors are the best in the world. At the time of the adoption of the constitution, she was the most powerful State—her population was double that of New York. It was the boast of her statesmen that she was *prima inter pares*. What is she now? The population of New York is more than double—I think the next census will show nearly treble hers. Her land, cultivated by unwilling hands, is unproductive. Travel through the adjoining states of Ohio and Pennsylvania, and you will see that the land produces more than double as much as the same kind of land in Virginia. In the free States, new towns are everywhere springing up and thriving: the land is becoming more productive: smiling habitations are within hail of each other: the whole country is dotted with school houses and churches, almost within sight of each other; and, except under peculiar circumstances their manufactures and mechanic arts furnish lucrative employment to all their people; and their population steadily and rapidly increasing. Turn again to Virginia. There is scarcely a new town, except at one or two points, within her whole borders. Her ancient villages wear the appearance of mournful decay. Her minerals and timbers are unwrought. Her noble water-power is but partially occupied. Her fine harbors are without ships, except from other ports; and her seaport towns are without commerce, and falling to decay. Ask yourself the cause, sir, and I will abide the answer. It is essential to the existence of republics that education should be generally diffused among the people. Slavery prevents this. Rich men employ private tutors, or send their children abroad. But the children of the people cannot be educated without the instrumentality of district schools. In slave States, where the plantations are large, the white population is too sparse ever to maintain them. Beside, there is another fatal obstacle to them in the aversion of the rich to associate with the poor. The poor white laborer's children could never be permitted to mingle in the same schools, and sit upon the same benches, with the rich man's sons. That would be offensive.

Slavery enfeebles a nation in war, as well as in peace. It is impossible that a nation of masters and slaves can be as powerful and formidable, either in offensive or defensive war, as a nation of freemen. A large portion of her population must remain at home, to prevent the rebellion of those who are constantly in a state of latent warfare with their oppressors. I know, sir, we have had a most alarming description of the prowess of the south. We have heard their cannon roar; seen their bayonets bristle; heard the war-cry of the charging chivalry, and seen their bowie-knives gleam within this hall, in the vivid picture of the terrible gentleman from North Carolina, (Mr. Clingman.)

We have often been modestly reminded of the "blood and treasure, and the gallantry of the south." This I do not dispute. I am proud to admit that she has furnished many gallant sons, whose names will adorn the brightest pages of our history, both for the war of the Revolution, the war of 1812, and the war which we lately assumed as the ally of Texas and of Slavery.

I give her full credit for her patriotism in furnishing most of the men who have borne the official burdens of the government, both in the civil and the military list. I know, too, that she has furnished the kind of men for our armies, who are apt to be distinguished when great deeds are to be done; for it is only the officers and commanders of the armies who live in story. The stout hearts and strong arms of the common soldiers, that fight the battles and win the victories, are unknown to fame. Their birth place is not sought for: their graves are undistinguished. And the south has always furnished officers for our armies; Presidents for the Republic; most of our foreign ambassadors; heads of departments; chief of bureaus; and sometimes, in her proud humility, has consented that the younger sons of her dilapidated houses should monopolize the places of clerks and messengers to the government.

But whence are drawn the common soldiery, the men who peril their lives and win victories for your glory? Almost entirely from the free States, except in cases of sudden emergency, when volunteers are called nearest the scene of danger. The present Secretary of War, a southern gentleman of great ability, and strenuous for southern rights, says, in his report:

"According to the practice which has long prevailed, the great majority of enlistments is made in the northern Atlantic cities and the adjacent interior towns, whence the recruits are sent to the general depot for instruction, and finally distributed to the southern and western posts, according to the wants of the service."

Yes, sir, our northern freemen have always filled the ranks of the regular army. The south has lent us the gentleman to wear the epaulettes and the sword; to take command of our troops, and lead them to southern and south-western climates, to fight the frontier battles, and whiten your fields with their bones.

I am opposed to the diffusion of Slavery, because confining it within its present limits will bring the States themselves to its gradual abolition. Let this disease spread, and although it will render the whole body leprous and loathsome, yet it will long survive. Confine it, and like the cancer that is tending to the heart, it must be eradicated, or it will eat out the vitals. The sooner the patient is convinced of this the sooner he will procure the healing operation.

The learned and able gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Meade,) in a pamphlet which he laid upon our table, takes the same view of it. He says: "Virginia has a slave population of near half a million, whose value is chiefly dependent on southern demand."

Let us pause a moment over this humiliating confession. In plain English, what does it mean?—That Virginia is now only fit to be the breeder, not the employer, of slaves. That she is reduced to the condition that her proud chivalry are compelled to turn slave traders for a livelihood! Instead of attempting to renovate the soil, and by their own honest labor compelling the earth to yield her abundance: instead of seeking for the best breed of cattle and horses to feed on her hills and valleys, and fertilize the land, the sons of that great State must devote their time to lecting and grooming the most lusty sires and most fruitful wenches, to supply the slave barracoons of the south! And the learned gentleman pathetically laments that the profits of this genteel traffic will be greatly lessened by the circumscription of Slavery! This is his picture, not mine.

The same gentleman says, in the same speech: "If we intend to submit to the policy of confining the slaves within their present limits, we should commence forthwith the work of gradual emancipation; it is an easier task for us than for our children."

The eloquent gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Hilliard) is of the same opinion. He said: "We must make up our minds either to resist the interdiction of the progress of Slavery, or to submit to an organic change in our constitution."

Yes, sir; this admitted result is, to my mind, one of the most agreeable consequences of the legitimate restriction of Slavery. Confine this malady within its present limits, surround it by a cordon of freemen that it cannot spread, and in less than twenty-five years, every slave-holding State in this Union will have on its statute book a law for the gradual and final extinction of Slavery. Then will have been consummated the fondest wishes of every patriot's heart. Then will our fair country be glorious, indeed; and be to posterity a bright example of the true principles of government—of universal freedom.

I am opposed to the extension of Slavery into Territories now free, for still graver reasons—because I am opposed to despotism throughout the world. I admit that this government cannot preach a crusade of liberty into other States and nations; much as she abhors tyrants and tyranny there, she can only mourn over its existence. But when the question of government is within her own control, and she permits despotism to exist, and aids its diffusion, she is responsible for it in the face of the civilized world, and before the God of Liberty.

In my judgment, not only the slave States, but the general government, recognising and aiding as it does Slavery, is a despotism. I do not use the word declamatory, but strictly legal signification. That government is despotic where the rulers govern subjects by their own mere will—by decrees and laws emanating from their uncontrolled will, in the enactment and extension of which the ruled have no voice, and under which they have no right, except at the will of the rulers. Despotism does not depend upon the number of the rulers, or the number of the subjects. It may have one ruler or many. Rome was a despotism under Nero; so she was under the triumvirate. Athens was a despotism under her thirty tyrants, under her four hundred tyrants, under her three thousand tyrants. It has been generally observed that despotism increases in severity with the number of despots: the responsibility is more divided, and the claims more numerous. The triumvirs each demanded his victims. The smaller the number of subjects in proportion to the tyrants, the more cruel the oppression, because the less danger from rebellion. In this government, the free white citizens are the rulers—the sovereigns, as we delight to be called.—All others are subjects. There are, perhaps, some sixteen or seventeen millions of sovereigns, and some four millions of subjects.

The rulers and the ruled are of all colors, from the clear white of Caucasian tribes to the swarthy Ethiopian. The former, by courtesy, are called white: the latter, black. In this government, the subject has no rights, social, political, or personal. He has no voice in the laws which govern him. He can hold no property. His very wife and children are not his. His labor is another's. He, and all that appertains to him, are the absolute property of his rulers. He is governed, bought, sold, punished, executed, by laws to which he never gave his assent, and by rulers whom he never chose. He is not a serf merely, with half the rights of men, like the subjects of despotic Russia, but a naked slave, stripped of every right which God and nature gave him, and which the high spirit of our revolution declared inalienable—which he himself could not surrender, and which man could not take from him. Is he not, then, the subject of despotic sway?

The slaves of Athens and of Rome were free, in comparison. They had some rights—could acquire some property—could choose their own masters, and purchase their own freedom: and when free, could rise in social and political life. The slaves of America, then, lie under the most absolute and grinding despotism that the world ever saw. But who are the despots? The rulers of the country—the sovereign [illegible]. The gentlemen from Georgia (Mr. Toombs) told us, in bold language, that "*this is a pro-slavery Government.*" But how far, or in what respects it is such, he has not pointed out. Was it founded solely, or in part, for the support of Slavery?—for the purposes of oppression? He tells us that we "*are bound to maintain the dominion of the slaveholders over their slaves with our blood;* that we "*are bound to carry Slavery wherever our flag floats and we have exclusive jurisdiction.*"

Now, if this be the doctrine of the Constitution, gentlemen of the North, ought to understand it.—Duty admits of no medium course, by which we shall keep our covenant *in part*, and violate it in other parts.

We of the North, also, complain of encroachments upon our rights. These should be pointed out with precision and maintained with firmness, or they should be abandoned and surrendered. There is no intermediate course consistent with duty. I, for one, discard all compromises, and reject all offers to compromise. I came here to enforce, to carry out the provisions of the Constitution, not to compromise, nor to surrender the rights secured to us by that instrument.

I regard the constitutional obligations of this Government towards the institution of Slavery as too obvious to be misunderstood by statesmen. The line of demarcation which separates the people of free States from the support of Slavery has been so plainly drawn, that it would seem no intelligent, unprejudiced mind could mistake it. It is, however, true, that much obscurity is thrown upon the subject by the ingenuity and the sophistry of those who profess to reason upon it.

Much has been said about Slavery being the "creature of municipal law." Men in both political parties now urge, that "Slavery cannot exist, unless sustained by *municipal law*." They say that this is the doctrine of jurists; that the most profound judges have so decided. Others deny this doctrine. Now, what is the fact? History shows us that it was introduced into Virginia, and existed there for years, without any municipal regulation or authority. We know from history that it existed in each of the slave States of this Union long prior to the enactment of any laws on the subject. It found its way into Oregon, into California, Deseret, and, if we are to credit reports, it has been in New Mexico, without any law. It has been sustained in all those States and Territorries, not by municipal law, but by the superior physical and intellectual power of the white over the colored people. This was Slavery in *fact*, but not in *law*. For instance: Slavery continued in Ohio, even against the provisions of our Constitution, and in violation of all our laws, as late as the year 1840. It exists in Illinois to this day. Slaves are there bought and sold, not merely *without* law, but *against* law. But when those slaves become intelligent, and claim their rights before any court, the judges say that "*Slavery is the creature of municipal enactment;* that *there is no such enactment in Illinois, and therefore there is no Slavery in that State.*" The judge means by this, there is no *legal* Slavery there; while all are aware that negroes are there held in abject servitude, are oppressed and degraded, sold, and transferred from one professed owner to another, for the reason that the existing laws of that State are not enforced.

In a state of nature, the rights of all men are equal; but the superior intellectual and physical power of one man is often exerted to subject others to his will. In that State, however, each possesses the right of self-defence. Not so in slave States. There, the right of the slave to protect his liberty, or his life, is taken away by the laws of such State. For instance: if a slave in Virginia lifts his hand against his master in self-defence, the master may at once slay him with impunity. But this right of the master depends on the law of that State; and the moment the master goes beyond the jurisdiction of that State, this right ceases. Let him bring his slave to Ohio, and the moment they stand on our soil, under the jurisdiction of our laws, the slave becomes a *man*, possessing the equal rights, and powers, and privileges, with the master. Such is the case whenever they go beyond the jurisdiction of Virginia into free territory.

These principles have often been advanced.—They were familiar to our fathers. They had been declared by the courts of Great Britain, prior to our Revolution. Slavery at that time was discountenanced in all the colonies, excepting perhaps South Carolina and Georgia.

My colleague (Mr. Campbell) has shown in an able manner, that the objects of the people of the South, before and at the commencement of the Revolution, was the entire abolition of Slavery and of all slave laws. These objects were proclaimed in language most direct and appropriate, in 1776, when entering upon the war of the Revolution. After the close of that memorable struggle, the Confederated Congress, in 1783, sent out an address to the People of the United States, penned by Mr. Madison, in which they say, "Let it be remembered, finally, that it has been the pride and the boast of America that the rights for which she contended *were the rights of human nature.*" These sentiments then prevailed in all the States.

Each State at that time held jurisdiction over its western territory, and, so far as its ships were concerned over the high seas. Thus the laws of Virginia extended over her northwestern territory, and over all ships belonging to the people of that State while sailing upon the high seas; and Slavery, of course, existed both in that territory and on board of every ship thus subjected to the laws of that State.

In 1786, she ceded her territory to the United States. The jurisdiction was transferred, her laws ceased to be in force there, and Slavery ceased with them. By the Ordinance of 1787, Congress consecrated that vast region to freedom, by ordaining that Slavery should never more exist there. This was expected by the people. They desired it. Up to this period, each State held jurisdiction upon the high seas, and Slavery continued to exist there. But the convention then in session for the purpose of framing the Constitution, desired to make the high seas, also, *free*. South Carolina and Georgia insisted on retaining the slave trade; Northern members would not go into a union with a people devoted to that commerce, with powers to continue it indefinitely; and a compromise of the subject was the result.

By the 8th section of the first article of the Constitution, the States surrendered to Congress all jurisdiction over commerce and navigation of the high seas; and by the ninth section of the same article, it was provided that Congress should not prohibit the slave trade until the year 1808.

This stipulation, connected with the history of its adoption, shows in the most conclusive manner, the hostility then existing against that commerce in our own species. All expected that it would be abolished at the earliest moment at which Congress should possess the power to carry into effect the wishes and intentions of the people. Acting in accordance with this expectation, Congress prohibited the importation of slaves, under heavy penalties, [illegible] enacted in 1807, but which did not take effect until the 1st, of January, 1808.

This compromise of the Constitution has been fully carried out. The South enjoyed the benefits of the slave trade for the time stipulated, and the whole matter has passed by forever. Yet this compromise is cited by the gentleman from Georgia, to sustain the doctrine that this is a "pro-slavery Government," and the power given by the Constitution for Congress to prohibit Slavery under our flag, after 1808, he construes into an obligation to protect, in all coming time, wherever our flag may float. Such is the monstrosity of the slaveholding construction of the Constitution.

The gentleman from Georgia also cites that clause of the Constitution which relates to fugitive slaves, for the purpose of proving that we are bound to maintain the master's right to his slave with our blood. Under the old Confederation, when a slave escaped into another State he became free. At the formation of the Constitution, an amendment was presented, making it the duty of the free States to arrest and imprison fugitive slaves in the same manner they do fugitives from justice. But the amendment was rejected. The matter was compromised by a stipulation that the free States should "*pass no law nor regulation by which the slave should be discharged from the service of his master.*" The construction which this clause has received from the Supreme Court, makes it the duty of the free States not to *act*, but to *abstain* from action.

Now, sir, I am not aware that any State has passed laws to discharge fugitives from service. On the contrary, I believe every State has abstained from such legislation. That constitutes the whole duty of the free States. They owe no further duties on this subject under the Constitution. We live up to our compact. We admit it to the full extent. There we stop. This stipulation can imply nothing further than is expressed. It has relation to fugitive slaves only. No inference beyond that can be drawn from it. How gentlemen can infer from this clause that we are bound to maintain the power of the master over his slave with our blood, is another of those monstrous assumptions which slaveholders are accustomed to make, but for which they can assign no reason whatever.

There is no action obligatory upon the free States. They fulfil their whole duty by abstaining from action. Ohio does this, and I believe all the free States do it. The last clause of the paragraph, which, referring to the fugitive slave, says, he "shall be delivered up, on claim of the person to whom such service or labor may be due," has no reference to State legislation, or State action. That proposition was rejected by the Convention. The Supreme Court of the United States have placed a construction upon it. They hold that it refers to the individuals of the State, imposing upon them the duty of permitting the master to take the slave, in the same manner that we surrender up our friends to the officers of justice. They have decided that it is the duty of individuals not to secrete, or to defend, the slave against his master. They admit that the individual may act in aid of the master, but deny to the State all power of acting on the subject.

It is worthy of remark that this is the only instance in which Congress is authorized to legislate in favor of Slavery. On this point it is conceded that we may pass laws. But by this clause of the Constitution we are only authorized to legislate for the *arrest and return of fugitive slaves*. It does not make it our duty to legislate for the further benefit of the master. It is left for us to act agreeably to the dictates of our own judgment. We have the power to pass further laws or we may repeal the law of Congress now in force on that subject. But it gives us no power to go further in support of Slavery, and to pass laws for the protection of that institution within the States. Such interpretation would be a perversion of language, and of the intention of those who framed the Constitution. It was intended to give the master a right to reclaim his fugitive slave, and to Congress power to aid him in reclaiming such fugitive. Here the right and the power end; they extend no further. Nor has the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Toombs) informed us in what manner or by what rules of construction he infers any power in Congress, under this clause of the Constitution, to protect Slavery wherever our flag may float; or that it is our duty to *protect it with our blood*.

The next compromise of the Constitution to which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Toombs] refers, is that of the slave representation as provided in the 3d clause, 2d section, of the 1st article of the Constitution. In regard to this article, it would appear that no difference of opinion could possibly exist. There can be no doubt that it was intended to give the slave States an advantage over the free States. The slaves are not represented in this Hall, nor can we legislate for their benefit; but the slaveholders have a representation here, in proportion to the number of slaves they hold in bondage, counting five slaves equal to three freemen. For more than sixty years the slave States have enjoyed this privilege. No man has ever denied it to be their right under the Constitution. But it is equally plain that this clause was intended to give no further privilege. It alludes to no other subject, and cannot be construed to give any other powers. The gentleman [Mr. Toombs] referred to it to show that this is a slaveholding Government; that we are bound to maintain the master's power over his slave with our blood; and to carry Slavery wherever our flag floats. But the way and manner he brings this clause to sustain his positions, he has failed to show us. I repeat, that the whole object and intention of this clause has been thus far observed and carried out. South Carolina has now three representatives on this floor more than she would be entitled to, according to the number of her freemen; and twenty members from the slave States are admitted here solely by virtue of this superior advantage which the slave States possess over the People of the North.

It gives to the South an influence over our rights and interests, not according to their love of freedom, but proportioned to their disregard of liberty. The holder of five slaves exerts an influence in this Hall and in the Federal Government equal to four citizens of the free States; and the owner of a thousand slaves possesses political powers equal to six hundred citizens of the North.

I know of nothing more humiliating to the pride and dignity of our people than this inequality of our political influence. We are placed in a political position between the supercilious master and his crouching menial; superior to the one and inferior to the other. It was a compromise of Northern honor. It gave a bounty to oppression; bestowed privileges upon those who disregard "self-evident truth," and trample upon the inalienable rights of man; it has taught Northern men to regard slaveholders as politically entitled to superior consideration; it has taught us subjugation to slaveholding dictation. It was the force of this feeling which constrained Northern members on this floor to surrender up their own independence, and for years to unite with the South in excluding from consideration all petitions in relation to freedom of debate; passed your gag rules; struck your freedom of debate; sealed the lips of those who advocated the doctrines of political equality; and for many years held the National Government subservient to the slave power. It was this principle which for half a century caused Northern men to tremble at Southern threats to dissolve the Union; which now calls together the timid and the irresolute in our commercial cities, to pass resolutions against the maintenance of our own rights. The same feeling of servility is also manifested by a portion of the Northern press, which is always ready to advocate every slaveholding policy. Yet, sir, we abide by the compact. The slave States, from the adoption of the Constitution to this day, have enjoyed this privilege of a superior representation in this hall and in the election of President and Vice President. No Northern man has objected to carrying out this provision, which, of all others, is the most destructive to our interests and wounding to our pride.

But, sir, this concession was never intended to the slave States no other privilege than that of representation agreeably to the number of their slaves. It imposes no obligation, whatever, upon the people of the free States to maintain the "master's power over his slave with our blood," nor does it impose upon Congress the duty "*to protect Slavery wherever our flag floats.*" Nor can any inference, whatever, be drawn from this Constitution beyond its plain and obvious apportionment of representation and direct taxation.

In order to establish the duty of this Government to sustain Slavery we are referred to the obligation imposed upon us to "protect each of the States from invasion, and against domestic violence."

This provision extends to the free as well as to the slave States. History informs us that the rebellion in Massachusetts was the occasion of its adoption. Mr. Madison informs us that members from the slave States assured the Convention that they neither needed nor required any provision of the kind. But no man can mistake the object and design of this section. We are bound to protect every State from invasion. This protection is thrown around the *State*, including all the people therein; the rightful and the wicked, the loyal and the free, the black and the white, the hardened assassin, and the innocent child, are all protected. And you may allege that this clause was adopted to protect pirates and murderers, with the same propriety that you can assert it to have been adopted to protect slaveholders or any other men of a particular character.

The same reasoning applies to the suppression of domestic violence. We are bound to protect the people of the State against domestic violence. We do not institute an inquiry as to the character of the people! We do not ask whether they are slaves or masters, white or black, righteous or wicked. The insurgents are shot down by our troops without inquiring who they are! The master found in arms is shot down precisely as the slave, and the insurgent slave is butchered with just as little ceremony as the insurgent master. Indeed we know of no distinctions in such case. Our troops have nothing to do with *Slavery*; their duty is to quell the violence. That done, every slave in the State may walk off to Canada, in full view of our army, and they possess neither the right nor the constitutional power to interfere, or in any manner to prevent their escape. But in case of invasion, or of insurrection, the power of the Government in repelling the one or suppressing the other is unlimited by the Constitution. The whole physical power of the nation may then be brought into action for that purpose, and if deemed necessary by the Executive, who is the commander of the army and navy, he may liberate every slave in such State for the purpose of saving the people or of restoring peace. This is a power, however, lying behind the Constitution, based upon the right of self-defence, upon the duty of preserving the Government, and existing only in time of foreign or of civil war.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I have examined what we so often hear called the "Compromises of the Constitution." They consist entirely in the privilege conceded to the slave States, to continue the slave trade until 1808; to pursue and recapture their fugitive slaves; and to be allowed a representation in Congress proportioned to the number of their slaves. They have no further claims whatever in favor of Slavery. Beyond these, we are bound to act for freedom; for the political equality of all men; for the maintenance of "the rights of all to life and liberty." Aside from these, the people of the free States possess the clear and indisputable right to be separated, and entirely exempted from all participation in the support of Slavery, to be purified from its moral guilt and entirely absolved from its disgrace. If we do not thus separate ourselves from its moral and political contagion, it will be owing to the vitiated sentiment and the servile feelings of Northern members. If we remain contaminated with the crimes attendant upon the slave trade in this District and upon our Southern coast, the responsibility must rest upon those Northern members of Congress who are willing to continue their participation in the sale of men and of women, this treason against God and humanity.

But the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Toombs) says that we "have heretofore sustained the right of the master to hold his slave upon the high seas, and even in foreign ports." If this were correct, it would impose upon us no duty to violate the Constitution and defeat the entire objects for which our Government was instituted. But I will examine this point. Until the year 1808, the people of South Carolina and Georgia were *permitted* to import slaves. But they went to Africa at their *own peril*. We furnished them no protection. If, in attempting to seize and enslave the unoffending people of that country, they were slain, all regarded their fate as most just and righteous. When their victims were placed on shipboard, these dealers in human flesh looked not to this Government for protection. They depended upon physical force, upon chains and fetters, the scourge and thumbscrew, the pistol and dagger, for their safety, until they reached the jurisdiction of the slave States to which they hurried their cargo. There the laws of such State threw its protection around them; and if the slaves subsequently resisted their masters, the powers of the State were brought to the master's aid in holding his victim in subjection. But this permission of the slave trade expired in 1808, and the traffic was thenceforth entirely interdicted. At the same time, Congress restricted the coastwise slave trade, by imposing heavy penalties for transporting slaves from one of our own sea-ports to another, in vessels of less than forty tons burden, or without filing affidavits that the slaves were not imported after the year 1808; and the slave-dealers now pursue their vocation on our Southern coast at their own peril, precisely as they pursued the foreign slave trade prior to 1808. The United States have passed no law of Slavery authorizing one man to hold another as property upon the "high seas." While there, under the exclusive jurisdiction of our laws, the master has no more right to chastise his slave than the slave has to correct his master. The slave has the same right

SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES.

SPEECH OF HON. J. R. GIDDINGS, OF OHIO,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, March 18, 1850.

In Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, on the President's Message transmitting the Constitution of California.

Mr. Giddings said he regarded it as very desirable that gentlemen should understand each other, and that the issue between us should be defined, in order that the country might understand distinctly the questions on which we differ.

Complaints are made and reiterated by Southern gentlemen, that we are encroaching on the rights of the slave interest; but there is an apparent reluctance to come down to particulars, and to define those rights which they allege have been invaded. The gentlemen from Georgia (Mr. Toombs) told us, in bold language, that "*this is a pro-slavery Government.*" But how far, or in what respects it is such, he has not pointed out. Was it founded solely, or in part, for the support of Slavery?—for the purposes of oppression? He tells us that we "*are bound to maintain the dominion of the slaveholders over their slaves with our blood;* that we "*are bound to carry Slavery wherever our flag floats and we have exclusive jurisdiction.*"

Now, if this be the doctrine of the Constitution, gentlemen of the North, ought to understand it.—Duty admits of no medium course, by which we shall keep our covenant *in part*, and violate it in other parts.

We of the North, also, complain of encroachments upon our rights. These should be pointed out with precision and maintained with firmness, or they should be abandoned and surrendered. There is no intermediate course consistent with duty. I, for one, discard all compromises, and reject all offers to compromise. I came here to enforce, to carry out the provisions of the Constitution, not to compromise, nor to surrender the rights secured to us by that instrument.

I regard the constitutional obligations of this Government towards the institution of Slavery as too obvious to be misunderstood by statesmen. The line of demarcation which separates the people of free States from the support of Slavery has been so plainly drawn, that it would seem no intelligent, unprejudiced mind could mistake it. It is, however, true, that much obscurity is thrown upon the subject by the ingenuity and the sophistry of those who profess to reason upon it.

Much has been said about Slavery being the "creature of municipal law." Men in both political parties now urge, that "Slavery cannot exist, unless sustained by *municipal law*." They say that this is the doctrine of jurists; that the most profound judges have so decided. Others deny this doctrine. Now, what is the fact? History shows us that it was introduced into Virginia, and existed there for years, without any municipal regulation or authority. We know from history that it existed in each of the slave States of this Union long prior to the enactment of any laws on the subject. It found its way into Oregon, into California, Deseret, and, if we are to credit reports, it has been in New Mexico, without any law. It has been sustained in all those States and Territorries, not by municipal law, but by the superior physical and intellectual power of the white over the colored people. This was Slavery in *fact*, but not in *law*. For instance: Slavery continued in Ohio, even against the provisions of our Constitution, and in violation of all our laws, as late as the year 1840. It exists in Illinois to this day. Slaves are there bought and sold, not merely *without* law, but *against* law. But when those slaves become intelligent, and claim their rights before any court, the judges say that "*Slavery is the creature of municipal enactment;* that *there is no such enactment in Illinois, and therefore there is no Slavery in that State.*" The judge means by this, there is no *legal* Slavery there; while all are aware that negroes are there held in abject servitude, are oppressed and degraded, sold, and transferred from one professed owner to another, for the reason that the existing laws of that State are not enforced.

In a state of nature, the rights of all men are equal; but the superior intellectual and physical power of one man is often exerted to subject others to his will. In that State, however, each possesses the right of self-defence. Not so in slave States. There, the right of the slave to protect his liberty, or his life, is taken away by the laws of such State. For instance: if a slave in Virginia lifts his hand against his master in self-defence, the master may at once slay him with impunity. But this right of the master depends on the law of that State; and the moment the master goes beyond the jurisdiction of that State, this right ceases. Let him bring his slave to Ohio, and the moment they stand on our soil, under the jurisdiction of our laws, the slave becomes a *man*, possessing the equal rights, and powers, and privileges, with the master. Such is the case whenever they go beyond the jurisdiction of Virginia into free territory.

These principles have often been advanced.—They were familiar to our fathers. They had been declared by the courts of Great Britain, prior to our Revolution. Slavery at that time was discountenanced in all the colonies, excepting perhaps South Carolina and Georgia.

while there to defend his life and liberty which the master possesses. If either, in the act of legally defending himself, slay his assailant, there is no law of the United States, or of any State, or of nature, or of nature's God, that holds him responsible.

These are the doctrines most obviously applicable to this subject. They are clearly deducible from the Constitution, and should, in my opinion, at all times have been firmly maintained.

Yet it is true that the President and Senate have attempted to exert the national influence to establish the power of the master over his slave on the ocean, under the exclusive jurisdiction of our laws; it is also true that, by fraud and deception, compensation was obtained from the British Government for two cargoes of slaves who were made free by being shipwrecked and landing on British soil; but it is equally true that the imposition was discovered, the right of such protection denied, and all such compensation has been for the last twelve years withheld by England, and such claims have long since been abandoned by the Executive.

When in 1838 the British ministers refused to listen to the claims of this Government for indemnity to the slaveholders, whose victims on board the ship Enterprise had been manumitted by shipwreck, on the British island of New Providence, a distinguished Senator from South Carolina, (Mr. Calhoun) impatient at delay, offered resolutions in the other end of the Capitol, declaring, in substance, not merely that Slavery existed upon the high seas on board American vessels, but that such vessels carried with them the relation of master and slave, when driven by stress of weather into the port of a foreign nation. In truth, the resolutions, so far as that body could do, pledged the nation to sustain the claims of these dealers in human flesh. No member objected to this doctrine, so repugnant to every principle of justice, and so directly opposed to the Constitution and to international law. The voice of Massachusetts, of New England, of New York, and Ohio, was then silent. Not even a vote from the whole North was recorded against these propositions. The spirit of Northern Liberty then slept, so far as that body was concerned; that voice, which is now so ready to abandon the Wilmot Proviso—so willing for the admission of more slave States—so anxious to give further aid to the slaveholder, as he pursues his trembling victim within our free States, was then silent. That Senator opened not his lips, neither did he vote on that occasion. From an examination of the journal, I discover the name of but one Whig from the free States who voted on that occasion. He voted for adopting the resolutions. The others *appear to have been absent.*

Every Southern Senator of both parties, and all Northern Democrats who voted, gave their support in favor of the resolutions. This was in the year 1840; and soon after that period, one of the Senators (Mr. Webster) who *did not vote* on those resolutions, was called to preside over the State Department, under President Tyler. While he was thus guiding the most important branch of the Executive duties, the case of the Creole occurred. That ship sailed from Richmond, with a cargo of slaves, in October, 1841; while on the high seas the slaves rose, asserted their right to freedom, and slew one of the slavedealers who attempted to reduce them to subjection, and, guiding the ship to the Island of New Providence, went on shore, and became entirely free. The piratical dealers, who professed to own the people thus restored to freedom, called on the President to aid them in obtaining indemnity for their loss; and Mr. Webster was requested to carry out the doctrine for which he and other Northern Senators had refused to vote. A statesman bred up and educated in New England, one who had long breathed the free air of the North, who had been taught the language of freedom, condescended to become the agent and solicitor of those who deal in human flesh, and to exert his official influence to maintain a commerce in the bodies of men and of women.

The attention of the nation, however, was called to these facts by resolutions presented in this body. The proceeding of the Executive was condemned by all.—Slaveholders were willing to sustain the doctrine given up. The State Department receded from its position; the celebrated resolutions which were intended to establish new principles in the law of nations, remain a dead letter upon the journal of the Senate.—The owners of the slaves of the Creole have pocketed their loss; and the slaves themselves are now most of them British subjects, and a few are freemen residents of our free States. Yet, sir, these attempts of Mr. Calhoun, aided by Southern slaveholders, and of Mr. Webster, and President Tyler, to commit the nation to the doctrines contended for by the gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. Toombs,) are now quoted in both ends of the Capitol, to show that we are "bound to carry Slavery wherever our flag floats." This signal *failture* to sustain the doctrine is constantly cited by slaveholders to demonstrate its correctness. The reasoning is of that absurd character which requires only to be stated to be appreciated. The views which I have thus advanced are not new. They have been often asserted here and elsewhere, but it seems that no arguments, no facts, no exposure of the sophistry and the absurdity of slaveholding doctrines will prevent their repetition; and when reasserted, we are constrained to reply to them.

The gentleman from Georgia also insists that slaves are property; that they have been recognized as such; and that the Government is bound to protect the master's right to the slave in the same manner that we are bound to protect him in the enjoyment of other property. Such was once the opinion of English jurists, but it was in a darker age. The latest decision to that effect in the English courts bears date more than a hundred years since. In 1772, Lord Mansfield denied the doctrine, and combated it with such arguments as to set the matter forever at rest in the courts of Great Britain. From the commencement of the Revolution to this day we have refused to admit that slaves are property. This Government has always refused to pay for slaves killed or lost in the public service. In 1816, Congress passed a law making compensation for property lost or destroyed in the service of Government. Pending the bill, a motion was made so to amend it as to allow compensation for slaves killed or lost while in the public service, in the same manner as the Government paid for other property; but the amendment was rejected by a large majority, there being only thirty-two members in favor of it. In 1828, the case of "D'Auterive" came before Congress. The slave, horse, and cart of the claimant were pressed into the public service against his consent, on the day of battle at New Orleans. His slave and horse were killed, and cart destroyed; and the owner called on Congress to make compensation.—A bill was reported paying for the horse and cart, but refusing to pay for the slave. The claim was of the strongest possible character. It was discussed some weeks, when it was laid on the table, and has never been heard from since. In 1832, the case of Larche, of the same character, was rejected. In 1842, another attempt was made to induce Congress to pay for slaves lost in East Florida by the action of our troops in 1814, but the claim was rejected—only thirty-six members voting for it. During the last Congress, efforts were made to pass bills to pay for slaves, but none of them succeeded. In the 28th Congress, a bill to pay for a slave lost in the Florida war came to this body from the Senate. It was committed to the Committee of the Whole House. I was perfectly aware of its character, and called the attention of my venerable and lamented friend from Massachusetts, (Mr. Adams,) to it. I know it was his intention to oppose its passage, but on one of those days when bills are hurried through this body under the rules without objection, it passed. I was myself unable to be present, and it escaped the notice of Mr. Adams, and became a law. No man will for a moment pretend that an accident of that character constitutes a precedent or establishes any principle. With this exception, Congress, from the first session under the old Confederation to this day, has rejected the principle that "*man can hold property in man.*" Mr. Madison declared in Convention that "*it would be wrong to admit in the Constitution* THAT THERE COULD BE PROPERTY IN MAN." To this opinion of Mr. Madison, every member assented. No one controverted it. To that doctrine Congress, as well as the Supreme Court of the United States, has at all times adhered.—Yet we are constantly told that slaves *are property*, and gentlemen appeared determined to overthrow, not merely the practice of the Government, the decisions of the courts, and the Constitution itself, in order to sustain Slavery, but they seem disposed to repeal the law of nature, and reverse the decrees of God himself, in order to bring his image to the level of the brutes that perish.

I have now answered all the positions of the gentleman from Georgia which I regard as material. I have paid particular attention to his speech, as I am not aware that any other Southern member has dwelt upon the constitutional obligations of this Government towards Slavery. I will now turn my attention to the question of extending Slavery into our newly acquired Territories.

It is constantly asserted that, "by adopting the Wilmot Proviso, we shall *exclude the people of the South from emigrating to those Territories with their property.*" They charge us with attempting to create "distinctions between the people of the free and those of the slave States." These arguments are unfounded. The exclusion of Slavery is for the express purpose of permitting all men, of every State, and nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, under heaven, to go there "*upon terms of perfect equality.*" We propose to give to *all*, the same protection, the same security to life, liberty, and property, to admit of no distinctions except those of moral worth. It is this "*equality of political rights*" to which Southern men *object*, and not to the want of it. Their excitement arises from the fact, that we recognize *no* distinction, that we will permit no man to hold the body of another at his disposal, to deprive him of liberty, to beat and scourge, to degrade and brutalize him. Such are our objects, and such are the objections to them. If, sir, we permit Slavery to establish itself in these territories we shall show ourselves unequal to the discharge of our duties as statesmen, and insensible to our obligations as Christians—we shall deserve and must receive the censure, the condemnation of the civilized world. It is not my purpose on this point to travel over ground already occupied.—The moral turpitude of permitting Slavery and slave markets to be established on territory hitherto consecrated to freedom has been ably examined by other gentlemen. There is, however, an obstruction, first advanced within the last two years, but now advocated by individuals of both political parties, denying our right to prohibit Slavery in these vast regions. I believe the devotees of this new theory admit that, owning the lands and holding the sovereignty of those Territories in our own hands, we may prohibit the robbing a man of his money, his watch, or his horse; but if the robber goes farther, and commits the greatest of all possible crimes, by robbing his fellow-man of his wife and children, of his liberty, his intellectual enjoyments, his future hopes—of himself—such robbery must be permitted, and we have no right to prohibit it.

I stated that this theory was *novel*. It has certainly been discovered since 1776. Then our fathers declared "that Governments were instituted for the very purpose of securing *the people in the enjoyment of life and liberty.*" Now it is said that in establishing Government there, we must leave the question of liberty out of view, to be determined by the *people* of that country. Who do gentlemen mean by the *people?* Do they include all persons who now live in New Mexico, or who shall hereafter go there? Do they intend that each human being shall have a voice and a vote on this question of his own liberty? Will they by legislative enactments secure the right of such vote to every man? No, sir; such is not the intention of gentlemen who use this language. They intend that one portion of the people shall determine whether they will rob another portion of their liberty and hold them as *property.*—Such is the effect of this policy; yet gentlemen are unwilling to come out before the country and avow this intention in undisguised language.

Again, it is urged that Slavery cannot exist there.—In the opening of my remarks, I showed that it has existed in Oregon and California, that it now exists in Deseret, and, if we can credit accounts apparently correct, it has existed in New Mexico. In my opinion, the mines of New Mexico, will furnish as profitable employment for slaves as can be found upon the face of the earth. That, if permitted, those mines will be filled with a dense slave population. And such we know to be the opinion of slaveholders generally, and they are competent judges. I regard these arguments merely as apologies for leaving the question precisely as slaveholders desire it to be left. Time will not permit me to examine these points further.

While commenting upon the compromises of the Constitution, I spoke of the slave representation in Congress—the political position in which it placed the freemen of the North; that this position was intermediate between the supercilious master and his abject slave. I then called attention to the effect which this degrading position has had upon members of this body, upon the Northern press, and upon the timid and irresolute men of the North, generally. The question now propounded to us is, *shall this political inequality between ourselves and slaveholders be extended and increased?* Shall we consent or permit the holder of a thousand slaves in the mines of New Mexico to wield the same influence in this Government, and exert the same control over our commercial and national rights and interests, that is held and exerted by six hundred of our intelligent farmers of the North? Now, sir, the motto of our Northern people is, "no slave Territory; no more slave States." We intend to permit no increase of slave power. We will oppose it *now, hereafter, and at all times;* under all circumstances; in all legal and constitutional ways; by every honorable means. The Northern man who hesitates to oppose this outrage upon the interests, the honor, and the constitutional rights of the North, we regard as a traitor to freedom and to humanity.

But, sir, the most insidious treason against freedom and the North is that which urges upon us the propriety of leaving this question of Slavery entirely to the electors of the Territories. If they establish it, and form State Constitutions of a slaveholding character, then they urge that each shall be admitted into the Union as a slave State; and every holder of five slaves be entitled to an influence over our national rights and interests, equal to five laboring men of the North. He this insidious mode of degrading the Northern character, adds to his moral and political treason, the baseness of duplicity and of cowardice, and is far less entitled to our respect than he who comes out openly, and frankly declares that Northern laborers are less entitled to respect, and less qualified to discharge political duties, than are the slaveholders of the South.

Mr. Chairman, when we say it is our intention to admit "*no more slave States,*" to hold no "*slave territory,*" we mean what we say. On this point we discard the doctrine lately advanced in another part of the Capitol. We totally deny that we are under any moral, political, or constitutional obligation to admit another slave State from Texas. We deny that any contract exists between us and that State. There was a contract proposed and submitted to the only power in this Government capable of contracting—that is, the treaty-making power. That power rejected it. Texas came into the Union with full notice and full knowledge of these facts. She will not be deceived nor disappointed on this subject, if we refuse to admit a new slave State from her territory. She came in by joint resolution, and not by contract. I then denied, and still deny, that even the treaty-making power could impose on us a union with a foreign slave State upon such unequal terms. But most emphatically do I deny the doctrine that members of this House in 1845 had power to control my vote for the admission of a new State in 1850. They could admit a State, but they could place me under no obligation to act contrary to my own judgment. I am sworn to support the Constitution, and solemnly believe that this increasing and extending of the Slave Power is subversive of the Constitution.

Sir, to admit more slave States, thereby increasing the Slave Power, and surrendering the interests of humanity to the disposal of those who deny the "self-evident truth" of men's equality of natural rights, is not only a papable violation of the whole spirit of the Constitution, but it is at war with the vital objects, the whole design, of those who established our Government amidst toil and dangers.

The annexation of Texas was conceived and urged, and consummated, with the avowed intention of increasing the slave power. I do not charge Northern men with acting on this principle; but we know that the officers of the Government, the Executive, urged it expressly on these grounds. I then denounced it, as unconstitutional in its objects, its designs, and in the manner of its consummation. So too did a distinguished Senator from the other end of the Capitol, who now avows himself ready to vote for admitting these new slave States from Texas, for the very purpose of increasing the slave power in this Government.

Sir, what has wrought such a change in the mind of that distinguished Senator? Time will doubtless answer this question. But, sir, holding now, as I then did, that Congress may at any time *repeal* the joint resolution by which Texas was admitted—that those who voted for that resolution could by its adoption impose no duty on me to vote for admitting other new slave States, I shall at all times oppose such admission. These sovereign States, while united under the same Constitution must be *equal*. Texas brought with her no claim whatever to be divided into four slave States. She can no more claim a division than Ohio, New York, or Pennsylvania. The sole object for such a division is an increase of the slave power. To give it greater influence over the rights and the interests of the free States—to enable it more effectually to withstand the progress of truth and justice—to prolong its bloodstained and barbarous system of brutalizing our fellowmen.

But, sir, the day has arrived when the tendency, the effects and consequences of our official acts are known and understood by the People. He who now advocates an increase of the slave power, may as well openly and frankly avow his opposition to freedom, his hatred of the "inalienable rights" of man; and declare his intentions to sustain Oppression and Slavery. Our actions cannot be misunderstood in these times. He whose soul is imbued with the love of justice, of liberty, and of his race, will manifest it by his words, by his acts, by his votes. Sir, those acts and votes are "*known and read of all men.*"

It is also proposed to pass further and more stringent laws for the arrest and return of fugitive slaves; to make every postmaster, and deputy marshal, and other petty officer of this Government, resident in the free States, the catchpole of slave-hunters. We are to impose upon them the obligation to leave their shops or their fields, and give chase to the flying bondman as he hastens from the scene of his oppression; to seize the trembling victim of Southern cupidity; to assist in riveting the cold iron on his chafed limbs, and then to force him back to a land of chains and sighs and tears and suffering. Yes, sir, it is now gravely proposed that this Congress of Christian men, at this middle of the nineteenth century, boasting that we are surrounded by the most intelligent, free, and virtuous people upon the earth, shall turn our attention and exert our official influence—our legislative power—in favor of the vilest system of oppression known among civilized men; that we shall aid the arrant usurper of the South to hold his grasp upon his fellow-man to compel him to toil and to suffer under the scourge, for the benefit of his oppressor; that we will help rob him of his liberty, his enjoyments, his all, that others may revel in wealth. Sir, I would as soon turn slave hunter as I would vote for such a law. Yet I do not regret that such a measure is to come before us. I am willing to see members compelled to show their hands. I desire that the country shall understand who is willing thus to degrade the character of American statesmen by prostituting our official powers to such purposes.

But there are circumstances which render such action at this time still more objectionable and humiliating. Since the early history of the State in which I live, men have occasionally come from the slave States and kidnapped our colored people; and when such offenders have been demanded, as fugitives from justice under the Constitution, their surrender by the slave States has, I believe, at all times been refused. Yet, the Representatives of Ohio are now called upon to turn round and lend their influence to catch and return Southern slaves! When our free colored people visit the slave States, they are seized, imprisoned, sold, and enslaved; and Southern gentlemen now ask us to pass a law that shall make it the duty of our postmasters, and deputy marshals, to seize and return to bondage these very citizens of Ohio, should they persevere escape from their oppressors in the South, and return to their wives and children in their native State. Will the Representatives of Ohio vote for such a law?

The citizens of Massachusetts have been arrested in Southern ports and enslaved, imprisoned, degraded, and brutalized. They now moan and weep in chains. Representatives of the sovereignty of Massachusetts, when sent to those States, to test their proceedings judicially, have been driven by mob violence from their jurisdiction; and their Legislatures have passed laws, prohibiting, under severe penalties, all persons from prosecuting the rights of such enslaved citizens to freedom.

Sir, while the South thus violates and tramples upon the Constitution, while they treat the free States generally, and Massachusetts in particular, with most sovereign contempt, a distinguished statesman of New England, a representative of Massachusetts, comes forward, and, before the nation, chiding the people of the North for their remissness in arresting and returning fugitive slaves, proposes that we shall exert our legislative powers in favor of Southern practical slave-hunters.

Sir, the proposition is humiliating. I detest. I execrate such a policy. Sir, I have no language capable of describing my own feelings in regard to it. I would as soon legislate to make the people of the free States the slaves of the South, in direct and positive language, as I would vote for such a measure. To me, the slave-hunter is the most detestable human being that lives or moves upon the earth.

We cannot under the Constitution protect or secrete the slave from his master. But the Legislatures of free States may prohibit their own citizens from aiding or assisting the master to track out the panting fugitive, in order again to subject him to the lash and the thumb-screw. Such a law has been introduced into the Legislature of Ohio; and I am free to say, that if there be a crime for which I would hang a citizen of our State, it is that of aiding the slaveholder to seize his trembling victim upon soil consecrated to freedom.

You may pass such a law, and it will remain a dead letter upon your statute book. Our people know their rights, they understand their duties to the Government, to their fellow-men, and to their God. The law of kindness, of sympathy for the oppressed, of love to our fellow-men, is written upon our natures by the finger of the Most High. Can you repeal that law of the Almighty? Can you tear from the heart's core our love of justice—our hatred of crime? Sir, no legislation can effect that object.

Sir, we ought not to deceive Southern men. We should say to them, in all frankness and sincerity, that the day for arresting fugitive slaves within our free States has gone by forever. We abide by the Constitution; but that instrument does not give sufficient power to the master to secure his fugitive slave when he once reaches our free States. It has not come up to the expectations of the South in this respect. It fails to fetter the limbs, to stop the flight of the fugitives. They generally reach Canada, and there find an asylum, and every friend of humanity rejoices at their success.

The Constitution has also failed to protect our colored citizens when they go to Southern States. It has proved defective on this point. We are willing to amend it, but we would strike out of the entire provision relating to fugitive slaves. No such clause can find a place in any new Constitution.

In conclusion, I would assure Southern gentlemen, that a portion of our Northern citizens have determined on reforming the abuses which have rendered this nation subservient to the slave power.

We wish all to understand distinctly and fully our views and ulterior designs. We intend to limit and confine Slavery to its present bounds; to repeal all acts of Congress which sustain that institution; and totally to separate the people of the free States and the Federal Government from all responsibility of sustaining Slavery or the slave trade; to restore the Government to the position relative to that institution in which it was placed by the Constitution. We then hope to direct its energies and the influence of the nation in favor of justice, of truth, of liberty, and of humanity.

I am aware of the efforts now making to arrange and to compromise these questions to quiet this agitation; to roll back the tide of popular feeling now manifested, not only in our free States, but in Europe, and throughout the civilized world. Sir, feeble and impotent are the powers of Congress, when brought in conflict with that rising voice of the people now heard in every quarter of our nation. Can we, by legislation, take from twenty millions of freemen their consciences, their thoughts, their judgment? Can we prohibit their investigations of truth? This struggle has been going on for centuries. Men may denounce it, but it will go forward. Reforms in all ages, and in all nations, have been denounced. Oppression, Guilt, and Crime, always seek silence and darkness; but as intelligence increases, and becomes more and more generally diffused, abuses will be corrected, and the work of reformation will proceed.

For the last twelve years I have watched the progress of this great political revolution. Its advance has been regular, constant, and uninterrupted. I have seen the influence of the Executive, of Congress, of the public press generally, and of politicians, put forth to retard its progress, but they have not even checked its onward course.

The arrogance of the slave power has been beaten down, [illegible] and the annexation of new slave States out of the present State of Texas.

The whole country has been agitated ever since the commencement of this session of Congress with one great question—whether Slavery shall be extended over that vast territory which we have acquired from Mexico;—whether this curse is to be perpetuated indefinitely, I might almost say infinitely. That has been the question.

Minor questions have arisen in connexion with this. No other subject has received the serious attention of this Congress since the commencement of its session. We were all expecting, after seeing the speeches of the distinguished men in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, that the Senator of Massachusetts would come forward as the champion of liberty, that we might depend upon having a leader whom we should be glad to follow, in this battle between liberty and Slavery. Every one was asking what will Mr. Webster say. And how were we disappointed, how struck down with sadness and shame, when we saw his speech! Scarcely one moral sentiment is to be found in it from beginning to end. But on every division and every sub-division of the question between freedom and Slavery, he has abandoned and deserted us.

The first question, the greatest question undoubtedly was, whether the Wilmot Proviso should be extended over all the new territories. Mr. Webster knew the sentiment of Massachusetts. Again and again has it been expressed in every form upon that subject. And yet Daniel Webster now comes forward and abandons the Wilmot Proviso. He is ready to take his chance of liberty or Slavery in those new territories. He says that the will of God has settled it, that Slavery shall never exist in those territories; as if Slavery could not exist, and has not existed, in every part of the world! He knew it. He is not so ignorant, that he does not know that Slavery has been found everywhere—everywhere in Europe, and in all the original States of this Union. It has not been prevented in any region by the physical character and climate of that region. Wherever its introduction has been prevented, or it has been driven out, it has been by the spirit of the people. [Applause.] And yet Mr. Webster says, it is the will of God that Slavery shall not exist in that territory. Is that the opinion of Massachusetts? Are you prepared to take the chance? [No, no, from all parts of the hall]—to take the chance whether Slavery or liberty shall preside over that vast section of our country?

The next point, upon which Mr. Webster has abandoned us, is in regard to Texas. The act for the admission of Texas provides that new States, not exceeding four in number, may hereafter be formed out of the territory of Texas; and such States as may be formed out of that portion of territory lying south of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude shall be admitted into the Union without Slavery, as the people of each State asking admission may desire. Mr. Webster comes forward, and states that we are bound to admit four new slave States from Texas. I shall not attempt to argue the point with him at length; but I will make one or two remarks on it. Abler speakers, and those more prepared on this subject, will follow me.

The act admitting Texas was a palpable violation of the Constitution. Some of those who voted for it acknowledged it to be so. The treaty-making power is vested solely in the Senate. It requires two-thirds of the Senate to ratify a treaty. Knowing that two-thirds of the Senate could not be found in favor of a treaty of annexation with Texas, that State was admitted in this fraudulent manner—by an act of Congress. A more gross violation of the Constitution does not appear in our whole history.

Now, is such an act of Congress binding? [No! no!] Certainly not! All the principles of legislation settle it that one Congress cannot bind another. This is certainly true in all ordinary cases of legislation, but it is especially true in this case. Congress, having usurped the treaty-making power, the act itself is void, and cannot have the force of a treaty or contract.

But last and most humiliating of all, is what Mr. Webster has said in regard to Mr. Mason's bill for the pursuit of fugitive slaves. Long ago, Congress passed a severe law to facilitate slave-catching. I will not undertake to decide here, whether that act was constitutional or not. Many persons think that the Constitution does not authorise it. But, however that may be, there is a law providing for this pursuit. The Southern people have discovered that, in Massachusetts and in other States, this law is of little avail; that the popular feeling is such that they cannot capture their runaways here. (Cheers.) I trust that it will always be so. [Cheers redoubled.]

Now, then, Mr. Mason brings in a bill providing more convenient modes for the carrying back of fugitive slaves, and severe penalties for aiding them; and Mr. Webster comes forward to say, that he is ready to support that bill of abominations, and himself lead in the slave hunt. Is there any man here that will follow him? (A universal and most emphatic "NO!")

Besides, it is perfectly clear that the consent of Congress is required for the admission of these new States, even by the terms of the annexation act. Is Congress bound to give that assent? Has not Congress a right to judge? Certainly! But, beyond all this, no treaty, no contract to do wrong, is binding in morals. We should repudiate such a treaty; and Congress having unquestionably the legislative power and authority in the case, should refuse to admit any such State, and deny the obligation resulting from the act admitting Texas. When the act was passed, it was denounced as unconstitutional and void; and loud threats were made in Massachusetts of repeal on this ground. But Mr. Webster has forgotten all that!

Thus, fellow citizens, we have seen that the man who should be our leader, whom we all should have rejoiced to follow, who with his colossal intellect should have been the champion of freedom, has prostrated himself at the feet of Southern oppression!—You are called together to see what MASSACHUSETTS will say to this course of her chosen son. I trust that not only here will a proper response be given, but that from every city and town in this Commonwealth will a voice of thunder be sent up, to repudiate the sentiments that Mr. Webster has dared to utter, and thus to save the State he represents from being a participator in his crime and disgrace. (Loud and prolonged applause.)

Mr. Wm. A. White read to the meeting the following Letter from Hon. CHARLES F. ADAMS.

BOSTON, 23d March, 1850.

Messrs. *G. S. Hobe, Wendell Phillips, Francis Jackson,* Boston:

GENTLEMEN,—In the month of September, 1847, at a Whig Convention assembled at Springfield, Mr. Webster claimed before the world an exclusive right to the invention of the measure called the Wilmot Proviso, and expressed some dissatisfaction at the infringement made upon his patent by Mr. Wilmot. At that time, as an humble member of the body, I ventured, at some hazard, to express a doubt of his fidelity to the cause he was appearing to advocate. I did so, relying on the strength of the general maxim, that those who have really at heart the advancement of a cause, do not naturally seek to cast odium upon its other friends, on account of their zeal in its behalf, even though they may believe them to err in judgment in their way of supporting it. It did not seem to me as it a true friend to the maintenance of a public principle then in process of establishment against powerful opposition, would be likely to throw off any aid which he could get, be it ever so feeble. I could not trust him then, and there has never been a time since when I have seen reason to change my mind. The result, as shown in his late speech, only proves to me that I did him no wrong.

At the same time that I feel free to say this, I do not mean to deny to Mr. Webster, or any other gentleman of high political standing, the right of choosing his ground upon the great question of the age. From this time forth, he must be ranked in the same category with Mr. Calhoun, General Cass, Mr. Buchanan, and the other gentlemen who seek to make the Constitution the great bulwark of the slave power. This is a position so entirely abhorrent to my feeble notions, as well of moral law, as of political duty, that I cannot but range myself in the ranks of opposition. To try to make the Constitution justify tyranny or oppression is an experiment which can result only in weakening the public confidence in that instrument. It can never obliterate the lines which are written in the heart of man by a higher power than the will of a legislator. For one, I repudiate utterly the alliance. By me, the Constitution shall never be read in any spirit other than that in which it was formed, to wit, the expectation that under it 'Slavery would gradually wear out and expire.' These are the words of Mr. Webster himself. I can never consent that any opposite construction shall be allowed to annul all its most beneficent calculations.

It will not be convenient for me to attend the meeting to which you invite me on Monday evening next; but I trust its proceedings will serve to show to the country that in Massachusetts, the bare authority of leading individuals will avail little when it is used to conflict with the first principles of justice and of right.

I am, very respectfully, gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

The Rev. THEODORE PARKER, of Boston, then came forward, and, in a speech strong in argument, and replete with eloquence and wit, criticised the leading features of Mr. Webster's late speech. (We are happy to say, that a full and exact report of this speech will be speedily published.)

At the close of his speech, Mr. Parker presented the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That we consider the question of Slavery in the Territories of the United States, now before the Congress of the nation, as paramount to all merely commercial or political questions now before us; that it deserves and demands the serious attention of the people themselves, for the welfare of millions of men depends on the decision that shall be made.

Resolved That the recent speech of Hon. Daniel Webster in the Senate of the United States, on the subject of Slavery, is alike unworthy of a wise statesman and a good man, and is a speech 'NOT FIT TO BE MADE.' (The reading of this resolution was received by the great assembly with shouts of applause and long protracted cheering.)

Resolved, That in making this speech, Mr. Webster has been false to the great principles of Human Liberty, defends measures utterly at variance with the welfare of the nation, with common justice, and the inalienable rights of mankind:—1st. By repudiating the Ordinance of '87, in its application to California and New Mexico, as needlessly irritating to the South, on the absurd plea that it is 'useless to re-affirm an ordinance of Nature, or to re-enact the will of God,' while it is notorious that the great body of the slaveholders regard this new territory as suitable for slave labor, and that the war with Mexico was waged to acquire this territory and extend Slavery over it. 2d. By giving his sanction to a bill and its amendments now before the Senate, which aims for ever to deprive every fugitive of the right to a trial by jury to decide upon his condition; a bill which enables the slave-hunter to seize any person whom he may choose, and on his affidavit bring him before any judge of the United States Courts, before any commissioner, clerk, or marshal thereof, before any postmaster or collector of the customs of the United States, *present at that time*, and on the decision of the most petty postmaster, collector, or clerk, or commissioner of an United States Court, hurry off his victim to the South and irremediable bondage; a bill which allows the slave-hunter his oath, and forbids it to the fugitive, and which punishes with a fine of one thousand dollars, and twelve months' imprisonment any one who shall 'aid, abet, or assist' the fugitive to escape from his pursuer. 3d. By avowing his readiness to vote two hundred million dollars of the public money for the purpose of expatriating the free colored population of the South; a measure tending to benefit only the breeders of slaves and the oppressors of mankind. 4th. By maintaining that four new slave States may be made out of Texas, and that Congress has no right to oppose their admission as such into the Union.

Resolved, That it is unworthy of a Senator from Massachusetts, after dwelling on the alleged grievances which the South has suffered from the North, to omit in his *spoken speech*, all allusion to the oppressive laws of some Southern States, by which free colored citizens of the North, when going to the South on board ships, are taken and shut up in jail,—and in his *printed speech* to treat the matter with most slender and delicate reproof.

WENDELL PHILLIPS next addressed the meeting. He briefly reviewed several points of Mr. Webster's speech, contrasted the present with his past doctrines, referred to his course at the time of the annexation of Texas, and his virtual pledges since to go for the prohibition of Slavery in the new territory, and pronounced Mr. Webster 'an apostate to humanity.' (His speech will be hereafter published.)

The Rev. SAMUEL R. WARD of Syracuse, N. Y., (editor of the *Impartial Citizen*, and a member of the Liberty party) was called to the platform, and made a keen and a satirical speech upon the position of the Senator of Massachusetts, Hon. Daniel Webster, and that other Daniel, a Senator from New York, Daniel S. Dickinson, (the man who wished he had been born in old Virginia.) (Report of Mr. Ward's speech is unavoidably deferred this week for lack of space.)

Mr. GARRISON being called for, said he would put his remarks into a nut-shell. In view of Mr. Webster's speech, he had only to say of its author, at that late hour—

'Since he, miscalled the Morning Star,
Nor man, nor fiend, hath fallen so far!'

(Loud applause.)

The resolutions were then put to the meeting, and adopted by an unanimous and enthusiastic vote.

The meeting was then adjourned, *sine die.*

SAMUEL E. SEWALL, *President.*

FRANCIS JACKSON,
WILLIAM I. BOWDITCH,
BENJAMIN V. FRENCH, } *Vice-Presidents.*

WILLIAM A. WHITE,
SAMUEL MAY, JR. } *Secretaries.*

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment.—Without Compromise.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 1850.

IN the comments which we made a fortnight ago upon Mr. Webster's speech, we dwelt not upon his inconsistencies with himself, but upon his inconsistencies with truth. We should have felt no regret at his contradicting himself, if he would have done it in the manner which he seems to think so ludicrous in Senators Dix and Niles. There is a kind of inconsistency over which, we are told, there is joy in Heaven.

We doubted the accuracy of Mr. Webster's statement with regard to the ground on which the Greek Philosophers defended Slavery, we should rather say accounted for it. We have since read what Aristotle says upon the subject, and find that we were right. Aristotle allows that there were those who condemned Slavery altogether as being contrary to natural right, and then puts the right of the master upon the same foundation with Carlyle, namely, Might. This he does rather as if he were summing up what might be said on that side, than as if he were stating or defending opinions of his own.

The theory, after the elimination of everything unessential, reduces itself to this—that it is the natural law for the wiser to be master of the less wise. It will appear at once that it is a *non sequitur* to say that this involves an ownership, or that one of the terms of the relation is the "beneficent whip." The *government*, we may admit, the *mode* of it is a totally different question. The Sun governs the planets of its system without aid of the lash, and we cannot help thinking that unwisdom is properly subjected to wisdom in a manner more akin to an eternal law of gravitation, than to the sudden and violent application of physical force.

J. R. L.

The *Liberator* of last week gives the following report of the Faneuil Hall meeting of the 25th ultimo. The speeches (in full) of Theodore Parker and Wendell Phillips are this week deferred for want of room.

GREAT MEETING IN FANEUIL HALL.

Pursuant to a call made in the public journals for a meeting of citizens who have read with surprise, alarm and deep regret the recent speech of the Hon. Daniel Webster in the United States Senate, on the subject of Slavery, a very large concourse of citizens assembled in Faneuil Hall on Monday evening, March 25, and at 7 1-2 o'clock were called to order by Francis Jackson of Boston.

The following persons, having been nominated as officers of the meeting, were unanimously accepted by the meeting:—

President,
SAMUEL E. SEWALL, Esq.

Vice-Presidents,
FRANCIS JACKSON, WILLIAM I. BOWDITCH, and BENJAMIN V. FRENCH, Esqs.

Secretaries,
WILLIAM A. WHITE, Esq., and SAMUEL MAY, Jr.

Mr. SEWALL on taking the chair, read the call for the meeting, and made the following forcible and earnest remarks:—

FELLOW-CITIZENS:—This, according to the call under which we come together, is a 'meeting of the citizens of Boston and vicinity, who have read with surprise, alarm and deep regret the speech of the Hon. Daniel Webster in the United States Senate, on the subject of Slavery, and who are impressed with the duty and importance of bearing an emphatic public testimony against it, as in derogation of humanity and the cause of liberty universally, especially as it relates to the following points—viz: the non-application of the Wilmot Proviso to the territory of New Mexico, the adoption of Mr. Mason's bill for the seizure of [illegible] and the introduction of new slave States out of the present State of Texas.

The Rev. THEODORE PARKER, of Boston, then came forward, and, in a speech strong in argument, and replete with eloquence and wit, criticised the leading features of Mr. Webster's late speech. (We are happy to say, that a full and exact report of this speech will be speedily published.)

At the close of his speech, Mr. Parker presented the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That we consider the question of Slavery in the Territories of the United States, now before the Congress of the nation, as paramount to all merely commercial or political questions now before us; that it deserves and demands the serious attention of the people themselves, for the welfare of millions of men depends on the decision that shall be made.

Resolved That the recent speech of Hon. Daniel Webster in the Senate of the United States, on the subject of Slavery, is alike unworthy of a wise statesman and a good man, and is a speech 'NOT FIT TO BE MADE.' (The reading of this resolution was received by the great assembly with shouts of applause and long protracted cheering.)

Resolved, That in making this speech, Mr. Webster has been false to the great principles of Human Liberty, defends measures utterly at variance with the welfare of the nation, with common justice, and the inalienable rights of mankind:—1st. By repudiating the Ordinance of '87, in its application to California and New Mexico, as needlessly irritating to the South, on the absurd plea that it is 'useless to re-affirm an ordinance of Nature, or to re-enact the will of God,' while it is notorious that the great body of the slaveholders regard this new territory as suitable for slave labor, and that the war with Mexico was waged to acquire this territory and extend Slavery over it. 2d. By giving his sanction to a bill and its amendments now before the Senate, which aims for ever to deprive every fugitive of the right to a trial by jury to decide upon his condition; a bill which enables the slave-hunter to seize any person whom he may choose, and on his affidavit bring him before any judge of the United States Courts, before any commissioner, clerk, or marshal thereof, before any postmaster or collector of the customs of the United States, *present at that time*, and on the decision of the most petty postmaster, collector, or clerk, or commissioner of an United States Court, hurry off his victim to the South and irremediable bondage; a bill which allows the slave-hunter his oath, and forbids it to the fugitive, and which punishes with a fine of one thousand dollars, and twelve months' imprisonment any one who shall 'aid, abet, or assist' the fugitive to escape from his pursuer. 3d. By avowing his readiness to vote two hundred million dollars of the public money for the purpose of expatriating the free colored population of the South; a measure tending to benefit only the breeders of slaves and the oppressors of mankind. 4th. By maintaining that four new slave States may be made out of Texas, and that Congress has no right to oppose their admission as such into the Union.

Resolved, That it is unworthy of a Senator from Massachusetts, after dwelling on the alleged grievances which the South has suffered from the North, to omit in his *spoken speech*, all allusion to the oppressive laws of some Southern States, by which free colored citizens of the North, when going to the South on board ships, are taken and shut up in jail,—and in his *printed speech* to treat the matter with most slender and delicate reproof.

WENDELL PHILLIPS next addressed the meeting. He briefly reviewed several points of Mr. Webster's speech, contrasted the present with his past doctrines, referred to his course at the time of the annexation of Texas, and his virtual pledges since to go for the prohibition of Slavery in the new territory, and pronounced Mr. Webster 'an apostate to humanity.' (His speech will be hereafter published.)

The Rev. SAMUEL R. WARD of Syracuse, N. Y., (editor of the *Impartial Citizen*, and a member of the Liberty party) was called to the platform, and made a keen and a satirical speech upon the position of the Senator of Massachusetts, Hon. Daniel Webster, and that other Daniel, a Senator from New York, Daniel S. Dickinson, (the man who wished he had been born in old Virginia.) (Report of Mr. Ward's

grounds of exception. Guilty! How much, under all these thrilling circumstances which cluster around the case and throng our memories with the retrospect does this single word import, but the wilful, violent, and malicious destruction of the life of a fellow man in the peace of God, and under the protection of the law! Yes! of one in the midst of life, with bright hopes, warm affections, mutual attachments, strong, extensive and numerous, making life a blessing to himself and others. We allude thus to the injury you have inflicted, not for the purpose of awakening one unnecessary pang in a heart already lacerated, but to remind you of the irreparable wrong done to the victim of your cruelty, in sheer justice to him whose voice is now hushed in death, and whose wrongs can only be vindicated by the living action of the law. If, therefore, you may at any moment think your case a hard one, and your punishment too severe;—if one repining thought arises in your mind, or murmuring word seeks utterance from your lips—think! Oh think! of him instantly deprived of life by your guilty hand!—then if not lost to all sense of retributive justice—if you have any compunctious rising of conscience, you may be ready to exclaim, in the bitter anguish of truth, "I have sinned against Heaven and my own soul! My punishment is just! God be merciful to me a sinner!"

God grant that your example may afford a solemn warning to all, especially to the young. May it impress deeply, upon every mind the salutary lesson it is intended to teach, to guard against the indulgence of unhallowed and vindictive passion; to resist temptation to every selfish, sordid and wicked purpose; to listen to the warnings of conscience and yield to the claims of duty; and while they instinctively shrink with abhorrence from the first thought of assailing the life of another, may they learn to reverence the laws of God and society, designed to secure protection to their own. We forbear, from obvious considerations, from adding such words of advice as may sometimes be thought appropriate on occasions like the present, to address the illiterate, the degraded, the outcast, whose early life has been cast among the vicious, the neglected, the abandoned, who have been blest with no means of moral and religious culture—who have never received the benefits of cultivated society, nor enjoyed the sweet and ennobling influence of home. To such an one a word of advice upon an occasion so impressive may be a word fitly spoken and tend to good; but in a case like this, where these circumstances are all reversed, no word of ours could be more efficacious than the suggestions of your own bitter thoughts, to which we commend you.

But as we approach this last sad duty of pronouncing sentence, which is indeed the voice of the law, and not our own—yet in giving utterance, we cannot do it with feelings of indifference, as a formal and official act. God forbid that we should be prevented from indulging and expressing those irrepressible feelings of interest, sympathy and compassion which arise spontaneously in our hearts, and we do most sincerely and cordially deplore the distressing condition, into which crime has brought you.—And though we have no word of present consolation or of earthly hope to offer you in this hour of your affliction, yet we devoutly commend you to the mercy of our Heavenly Father, and with whom is abundance of mercy, and from whom we may all hope for pardon and peace. And now nothing remains but the solemn duty of pronouncing the sentence which the law fixes for the crime of murder, of which you stand convicted, which sentence is, that you, JOHN W. WEBSTER, be removed from this place and detained in close custody, in the prison of this county, and thence taken at such time as the Executive Government of this Commonwealth may by their warrant appoint, to the place of Execution, and there be Hung by the neck until you are Dead—and may God of his infinite goodness have mercy on your soul.

So striking a case can hardly fail to exercise a deep influence on the question of Capital Punishment in Massachusetts, whether the extreme penalty of the law be executed upon this wretched man or not.

A CHRISTIAN TOWN COUNCIL.—Lord Gough, late Commander-in-chief of the British forces in India, arrived recently in England, and was received everywhere with the honors always paid to successful conquerors. The Town Council of Southampton, alone did as Town council never did before by passing the following Resolution, much to the horror, no doubt, of the other Christian lieges of her gracious Majesty. The words of the Town council of Southampton deserve to be writ in letters of gold, but those just now are not at our command. We must not forget to state that Lord Gough actually landed at Southampton, but received no welcome from the civil authorities:

"That as war has ever been opposed to the best interests of mankind in its fearful consequences against the pecuniary, physical, and moral well-being of the people: That as it is also diametrically opposed to the precept and spirit of the Christian religion: And as this Council is composed of men professing Christianity, it would be grossly inconsistent for them to manifest any demonstration of approbation on the landing at this port of any general officer or other warrior: and more especially of one who has been so recently engaged in a most destructive war in India, almost a war of extermination, where, in many cases, no quarter was given, and the most barbarous excesses committed."

WHIGISM.—The *Washington Republic*, the organ, at the Capitol, of the Whig party, and of course the most authoritative and orthodox expounder of Whig doctrines, thus endorses the Websterian *pronunciamento*, and defines the present position of the party. Let it be read of men:

We regard the Wilmot proviso, in so far as it has any application to the Territories in dispute, as a bald humbug. It is so regarded by all persons at all familiar with the country, its inhabitants, its capacities and its products. The opinion is universal on this point, and hence the "Wilmot," at this day, is a mere unmeaning humbug.—Regarding it in this light, can any manner of good come from introducing bills into Congress for the purpose of pressing its adoption or rejection?—for obtaining a triumph of opinion one way or the other? We think not.

DEATH OF MR. CALHOUN.—The telegraph from Washington brings the intelligence of the death of JOHN CALDWELL CALHOUN, the great champion of human bondage, and the leader of that party in the Republic which counted men as brutes, and which demands the sacrifice of the rights of the many to the power of the few. To his friends and his equals, Mr. Calhoun has the reputation of having discharged well and nobly all the duties demanded by that relation, but to his inferiors, the servants of his household, though he may have clothed and fed them well, he has been from position and principle a cruel and heartless tyrant. So far as he may have believed himself to be acting right he is deserving of respect in having acted up to that belief; beyond that he is only to be regarded as one who was a systematic robber of the poorest of God's children. Better would it have been for the world had he never been born; but having lived we regret, in his death, that he had not lived long enough to accomplish the object of his life—the dissolution of the union of these States.

☞ FOR a Report of the singular scene between Mr. King, and Mr. Speaker Cobb, we refer to another column. It will be observed that Mr. Winthrop, who was called to the Chair, appointed the Committee to examine into the disputed question, and was careful to appoint several warm partizans of the Speaker, but not a single free-soiler—Mr. King's party. That Committee has since made its report, and nobody will be surprised that it should favor the Speaker. It says that with the word "message" in place of "bill" in Mr. King's motion of the 13th instant, the effect, if it had been adopted, would have been to close debate on both bill and message, "and to bring the Committee to a vote on it (the bill) as the first pending question or proposition or question incident to the message."

OHIO AND THE "FUGITIVE" QUESTION.—From the subjoined extract from a paper published at the seat of government of Ohio, we learn that a measure of extreme violation of the spirit of the Constitution of the United States, proposed in the Legislature of the State of Ohio, was defeated in the House of Representatives of that State. This we consider, at the present moment, an incident of happy augury for the peace and harmony of the Union.

The Bill *prohibiting the Officers and Citizens of Ohio from taking any steps to assist in the re-capture of fugitive slaves* was defeated yesterday in the House on its final passage.

So says the *National Intelligencer*, and the paragraph is approvingly copied by the *Journal of Commerce*. Both journals are evidently ignorant that this "measure of extreme violation of the spirit of the Constitution of the United States" is one which originated at the suggestion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the decision in the Prigg case, on the ground that the non-slave States having no right to interfere with the law of Congress relating to the re-capture of fugitives, might, if they chose, do this very thing which Ohio has just decided not to do.

☞ WE are indebted to Hon. JOHN P. HALE for several public documents, and among them the Speech of Mr. Stevens, which we copy in this week's *Standard*. Hon. ORIN FOWLER, of Massachusetts, will also accept our thanks for a copy of his Speech on the 11th inst. in the House.

Communications.

"Sons of Temperance."

MR. EDITOR:—Having given undeniable evidence that the Grand Division has refused to grant Charters to colored people, by proof which "Sons of Temperance" can neither deny, gainsay, or evade, viz: the "*Proceedings of the Grand Division*," I will now ask—Are colored people entirely free from the evils of intemperance? If not, is it not the duty of honest men, claiming "charity," and "benevolence," to assist and encourage them, in measures calculated to reform them, and improve their moral and social condition? If the "Order" is calculated to promote the moral and social improvement of white men, is it not equally calculated to effect the same results in the case of black men? If Sons of Temperance are honest in their laudations of their "Order" are they not bound to give the human species, who may wish, the benefits of the institution, without regard to color or clime? They claim to be a "*moral institution*," and yet reject men, not for *immorality*, but for *color*, and at the same time *admit others guilty of the very highest (or lowest) species of immorality that human beings can commit*. Then in the name of common sense and common honesty, I advise them to talk no more of their "*moral institution*." Let them remember, at the same time, that TRUE CHARITY and BENEVOLENCE rests, if they exist at all on *moral goodness*. Then let us hear no more of their delusive cant about the "charitable and benevolent Order"; for it exists only in their empty, hypocritical, and impudent pretensions. You may say this is plain talk; but 'tis my way: it is, however, none too plain for honest men, and not perhaps half plain enough for slaveholding hypocrites. Truth needs no varnishing or sweetening with the palaver of Falsehood, to render it palatable to honest men; and I shall not waste time in trying to make it pleasant to the taste of rogues.

I have asserted that the Grand Division of New York has given positive proof, by its very acts, that it would annihilate a Sub Division for admitting a colored member. And now for the proof of this. REV. S. R. WARD, now publisher of the *Impartial Citizen*, in Syracuse was admitted a member of a Sub Division in the village of Cortland, Cortland county. Being a *colored* man, the Grand Division instructed the Deputy G. W. P. there, to take measures for his expulsion. This the D. G. W. P. refused to do; and for it was censured by the Grand Division, who immediately sent on a Special Deputy for that purpose. The Special Deputy was *Mr. Cady*. At that time, JOHN THOMAS, ESQ., Editor of the *Liberty Party Paper*, was "Worthy Patriarch" of this Sub Division. In reply to MR. J. NEWTON, in his paper, MR. THOMAS says:

Mr. Cady informed us, that the terms of the Constitution did not exclude colored men, but that they were excluded *in adaptation to Southern feelings, and the prejudices and customs of the country*. He told us, that to admit them into the Society, would displease the Society; *for their brethren in the South would not endure it*.

"Our conversation with Mr. Cady was in regard to the exclusion of Rev. S. R. Ward from the Society of the Sons of Temperance, in Cortland Village. We were told that unless the Society excluded him, the Charter would be annulled; and because the Society was driven to this crisis it voluntarily dissolved, preferring dissolution to the perpetration of such an outrage."

Here, then, is sufficient evidence for what I have asserted,—evidence that cannot be denied. There is abundant evidence to prove even more than I have asserted. It is in direct violation of the Constitution, but in accordance with the dictation of Southern man-stealing, but "honorable," "respectable," and "worthy" "Sons of Temperance." Colored men are excluded "*in adaptation to Southern feelings*;" and the "*brethren in the South would not endure it*." Oh, cringing, truckling, "respectable," "moral," "honorable," "charitable," and "benevolent" Slavery—sanctioning "Sons of Temperance!" you deserve a name and a place among other consumate hypocrites and *tyrants*, and coming generations—nay, the present generation—will assign you your proper station.

This is not the only case in which we hav the action of the Grand Division against people of color, and in accordance with the "*feelings*" *of their* "*brethren in the South*." By examining the "Proceedings of the Grand Division for 1847," you will find that Capt. Cady officially censured O. H. SALISBURY for initiating a colored man into a Division. And, what is more, you will find the Grand Division sustained Cady's action!

MR. J. W. LOGUEN, of Syracuse, (colored,) was duly proposed to one of the Divisions in that city. The Committee reported favorably, but he received "black balls" enough to reject him. A Committee wrote to the Grand Division to know whether a black man could be admitted. The answer returned was, that "INASMUCH AS THE GRAND DIVISION DO NOT GRANT BLACK MEN CHARTERS TO FORM DIVISIONS, BLACK MEN OUGHT NOT TO BE ADMITTED TO LOCAL DIVISIONS." This tells the whole story: and this decision, be it known, has been given by the "Grand Division of the Sons of Temperance of the State of New York," in 1850!

This matter is, I am glad to say, beginning to demand the attention of not a few throughout the country. I will here say, that I am not the only one who has left this Slavery sanctioning clan, and for *this reason!*—A "Convention of the Sons of Temperance, in Onondaga County, have taken this matter in hand to investigate it, and from their proceeding I here extract the following:

"The following resolution, reported by minority, was, after considerable discussion, referred to a Committee of three, to enquire into, and state the facts, with dates, &c., and report at the next meeting of the Convention.

"*Resolved*, That we disapprove the action of the Grand Division, in making "color of skin" a test of membership, instead of moral character, as laid down in our Constitution.

"S. KING,
"WM. W. TRIPP"

This Convention again meets the 2d. Thursday in April next, when this matter will be laid before them, for their consideration.

I have now shown some part of the action of this pro-slavery "Order." I challenge any contradiction. I have shown that it refuses Charters to colored men; that it refuses their admission into Subordinate Divisions, let their moral character be every so good; that they will censure and even annihilate Sub-Divisions, for admitting colored men,—because, as their Special Deputy declares, *their* "*brethren in the South will not endure it*."—and "*in adaptation to Southern feelings*"!! I ask, then, can an honest man, a friend to truth, justice, and humanity, hold connection any longer with this clan of cringing hypocrites, calling themselves "Sons of Temperance"?

In truth Yours,
MATTHEW FARRINGTON.

WAPPINGER'S FALLS, March 26, 1850.

Congressional.

THE same day, the 26th ult., on which Messrs. Benton and Foote had their quarrel in the Senate, an equally exciting but more important scene took place in the House, of which the principal actors were Preston King, of New York, and Speaker Cobb. It is reported as follows:

Mr. Preston King, of New York, (free soil) asked leave to offer a resolution to close all debate in committee, on the——day of——on the bill for the admission of California into the Union.

The Speaker decided the resolution not to be in order, because the bill was not referred to the Committee by the House. A resolution could be offered, however, only to stop debate on the California message, which the House had referred.

Mr. King said that his desire was to get a vote on the bill by the House, asking whether it was in order to debate.

The Speaker said it was a privileged question.

Mr. King, in attempting to speak, was several times called to order.

The Speaker said that the resolution was not debatable.

Mr. King then claimed the question as one of privilege.

Mr. McLane—What is the point of order?

Mr. King—That the decision of the Speaker is an after-thought, and designed to accomplish a certain purpose.

Mr. Inge, (Loco.) of Alabama—That is not a question of privilege. I insist on the order of business.

Mr. King—My object in offering the resolution was two-fold. First, to indicate my willingness to vote for the admission of California, independently of other questions.

Mr. Stephens, (Whig,) of Georgia—I call the gentleman to order.

The Speaker—The gentleman from New York, has stated no question of privilege, and is not in order.

Mr. King—If you will hear me, I will state it. I charge that the journal of the House has been mutilated. On the 13th instant, I offered a resolution, similar to the one of this morning. I simply requested the Clerk to fill up the blank, to close the debate on the California bill.

Mr. Stephens—I call upon the gentleman to state wherein the journal has been mutilated.

The Speaker—The gentleman must lay the charge against some person. (Sensation.)

Mr. King—I will state what I heard.

Mr. Inge—I object to that.

The Speaker—The gentleman will submit his charge against the person.

Mr. King—I was informed, by a subordinate clerk, that it had been done, and by the direction of the Speaker.

The Speaker—the gentleman charges the Speaker of the House has mutilated the journal.

Mr. Inge—That is the charge.

Mr. McLane—I ask for a Committee of Investigation.

Mr. Stephens—I insist on my point until the gentleman states specifically the mutilation complained of.

The Speaker—The gentleman charges that the Speaker mutilated the journal after the resolution had been acted on by the House.

Mr. King—The Chair does not state it in my precise language.

The Speaker—Will the gentleman put his charge in writing?

Mr. King sat down to write. Meanwhile the members were breathlessly silent. Mr. King in a short time sent the charge in writing to the Clerk to read.—It is as follows:

I charge that the journal of the 12th inst. has been mutilated by erasing the motion I made and interlining one I did not make.

Speaker—Incorporate the name of the person.

Mr. King—I was told that it was done by the direction of the Speaker.

Mr. Richardson, (Loco,) of Ill.—Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker asked the gentleman to suspend, and calling up Mr. Winthrop, (Whig,) of Massachusetts, to the chair, requested him to preside.

Mr. Cobb took his seat among the members.

Mr. Stephens—I would ask what is the motion, and what is the specification?

Mr. King—I made a motion on the 13th to end the debate on the California bill, and the word "bill" was erased, and the word "message" substituted.

The Speaker (*pro tem.*)—The Chair has a strong impression that the manual requires, where a charge is made that the journal has been altered or is incorrect, a Committee of the House must be appointed.

Mr. King—I repeat, I wanted to bring the California bill before the House.

Mr. Stephens—I insist, before the committee is raised, that there be a particular specification as to what was erased and what was substituted.

Mr. Holmes (Loco,) of South Carolina moved that the matter be referred to a committee of nine for investigation.

Then a member said (our dispatch does not give any name—probably Mr. King)—I called at the Clerk's office, and saw the journal. I asked the Clerk to bring it in and exhibit it to the House.

Mr. McLane—The gentleman made the charge very fully, that the Speaker had mutilated the journal. I ask him to complete the charge in his written charge.

The Speaker—The House cannot investigate when the name of the person is not specified.

Mr. Morse, (Loco,) of Louisiana, trusted that the friends of the Speaker will not attempt to evade the investigation.

Voices—"Who does?" "Who dreams of such a thing?" "A committe should be appointed!" "It was enough that the charge has been made by the Representative!"

Mr. Stephens said that his own respect would require that the charge be specified, and that it should not go to the committee until this be done.

Mr. Schenck, (Whig) of Ohio, would vote for the inquiry. The House owes it to their own honor and dignity.

Mr. King said that the Speaker erased the motion he made, and asked that the journal be produced.

The Clerk began to read the journal.

Mr. Bayly, (Loco) of Virginia, wanted to know whether the journal should be produced before the committee was appointed.

The Journal of 13th instant was partly read, showing that King's resolution was to close debate on California message, whereas he insisted that it was to close on the bill.

Mr. Holmes said that it was perfectly obvious that the question must go to a Committee of Investigation, and moved that a committee of five be appointed.

Mr. Richardson—Nine.

Mr. Holmes—Very well.

Mr. McClernand, (Loco,) of Illinois, spoke to the question offered.

There was much confusion throughout the proceedings—gentlemen jumping up and wanting to say something, and not more than one-half the members in their seats.

Mr. Cobb, the Speaker, asked leave to make an explanation.

Cries of "Sit down in front!"—"Order! order!" Silence now reigned, and

Mr. Cobb said—I do not wish to be understood as interposing any objection to the resolution which has been moved; but it is important, as I conceive, that an ample statement of what has occurred should go before the public in connection with the charge which has been made by the gentleman from New York, (Mr. King.) On the day indicated, the gentleman rose to a privileged question, under the rules of the House, to offer the usual resolution to stop the debate on the resolution pending before the Committee of the Whole. As you, sir, as you and the House are aware, it is a resolution very frequently offered, and resolutions to terminate debate, in blank, are always kept on hand. When the gentleman from New York arose and offered the resolution, he had not reduced it to writing, but requested the Clerk to do so. I directed that it should be done by the Clerk. The gentleman immediately made a motion to lay the resolution on the table. The House voted before the blank had been filled up by the Clerk. Subsequently I sent word to one of the Clerks that the resolution must read so as to stop debate on the California message, and so directed the Engrossing Clerk. I did not hear the direction to the Reading Clerk, and the resolution was filled up by him. You and the House know that it is my duty as Speaker to correct the journal of the House. It is read to me the morning after the adjournment. When the journal was read on the succeeding morning, the resolution was to stop the debate on the President's Message, and the California bill then pending before the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union. I instructed the Clerk to strike out the word "bill," giving him my reasons for not entertaining the motion to include the bill, namely, that it was a privileged question to move to stop debate on the message, because it had not been before the House, and as the House had no Parliamentary knowledge of the tendency of the bill, it could not entertain as a privileged motion a resolution to terminate the debate on it; thus the correction was made in my room, and the journal, as corrected, was read on the next morning to the House. The circumstances occurred just as I have narrated them. I have nothing more to say.

Mr. King said that the opinions of Mr. Cobb were such, that he did not vote for putting him in the Chair, because he could control on important questions.

"Order"

Mr. Richardson—I call the gentleman to order.

Mr. King—There was a rumor of an intention to smother the resolution to take the bill out of the Committee, and with a view to indicate the readiness to vote for California, without reference to any other matters.

Mr. Stevens did not offer the resolution at all.

Mr. King—The Clerk drew it up.

Mr. Holmes said that after the statement of the Speaker, there was no foundation for the charge, and he would therefore withdraw his resolution.

Several other gentlemen participated in the discussion.

Mr. Burt of South Carolina offered a resolution, "That the charge against the Speaker is, by Mr. King's own statement, without color of reason or foundation." He did not wish to make one remark in its support.

Mr. Bayly said he denounced the charge; a baser one had never been made.

Mr. Stevens moved the previous question, which motion was withdrawn to enable

Mr. Schenck to offer a resolution and a few remarks, denying that censure ought to have done——

Mr. Inge asked whether he (Mr. King) was willing to withdraw his charge.

Mr. King declined to do so. He had a high respect for the Speaker, and believed that nothing but constraint had induced him to alter the journal. Those who threatened the existence of the Government would not hesitate, by artifice, to accomplish their purpose.

This remark produced great excitement. Mr. K. was loudly called to order, and the Speaker (*pro tem.*) rapped, and requested the gentlemen to take their seats. The House was in great confusion. The question of order was then raised, the several resolutions which had been ordered were again read, and everybody wanted to say something, and the House refused to second the demand for the previous question on Mr. Burt's resolution.

Mr. Wentworth said that if gentlemen wanted to raise a storm in the North, they had better make a martyr of Mr. King.

Mr. Holmes, at the instance of Mr. Venable, renewed his motion for a Committee of nine.

Mr. Venable, (Loco,) of North Carolina, contended that the Speaker had done what it was his duty to do.

Further proceeding took place, and finally, by a vote of 91 to 69, the resolution for a Committee of Investigation was agreed to.

Mr. Winthrop appointed the following on the Committee:

Mr. Holmes (Loco) of S. C., Mr. Vinton (Whig) of Ohio, Mr. Boyd (Loco) of Ky., Mr. Ashmun (Whig) of Mass., Mr. Doty (Loco) of Wis., Mr. Stephens (Whig) of Ga., Mr. Strong (Loco) of Penn., Mr. Gentry (Whig) of Tenn., Mr. Richardson (Loco) of Ill.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole on the California question.

Mr. Harris (Loco) of Ill. advocated the admission of California, and denounced the Nashville Convention.

Mr. Ashmun obtained the floor, and the Committee rose.

Mr. Cobb again in the Chair. The House adjourned.

General Intelligence.

Mrs. Sarah A. Nowell has received official notice of her appointment to the charge of the Post Office in Chelsea, Mass.

——GOV. BRIGGS of Massachusetts has appointed Thursday, April 11, as a day of fasting, humiliation and prayer.

——THE FOREST DIVORCE BILL has been disposed of by the Senate, by rejecting the whole bill, with the amendment adopted the day previously. This probably will settle the matter, as far as our Legislature is concerned.—*Philadelphia Ledger*.

——A WOMAN OF 107 YEARS BURNED. Sylvia Lockman, an old negro woman, at Trenton on Thursday afternoon last lit her pipe and laid down on her bed, when it is supposed she fell asleep, and the pipe falling from her mouth, the fire thereupon caught to her clothes and she was horribly burned. She lingered in great agony until Friday afternoon, and then died. The *True American* says she was 107 years of age, and that she originally came from Africa.—*Newark Advertiser*.

——A "MURDERED" MAN ALIVE.—The *Elmira Gazette* states that a Mr. Salisbury, who disappeared from that place in the fall and was supposed to be murdered, has been discovered at Waterloo, Seneca Co., where he has been all Winter, chopping wood. Two men by the name of Rorick and Russell, who were with him about the time of his disappearance, have been tried for murdering him during his absence, and fortunately acquitted. What induced him to leave so abruptly, he is not able to state.

——THE WILMOT PROVISO REPUDIATED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF MICHIGAN.—The Michigan House of Representatives, on the 19th inst., passed resolutions sustaining the course of Gen. Cass, on the Slavery question. Resolutions were then offered by Mr. Leech, embodying the principle of the Wilmot Proviso. They were rejected, 26 to 37. Thus are repealed the instructions of the last Legislature to Gen. Cass and his associate in the U. S. Senate, to vote in favor of the Wilmot Proviso.

——In England there is a population of 7,000,000 who can read and write, and the letters which passed through the Post Office last year were 356,000,000. In the United States, with a population of 5,000,000 capable of reading and writing, there were only 62,000,000 letters during the same period.

——HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION.—In the Ohio Legislature, the House have agreed to the Senate bill, exempting the homestead from sale or execution.

——SLAVES IN CALIFORNIA.—In looking over the names of the members of the House of Representatives of California, we perceive that of our "ancient friend," John H. Watson, formerly of Columbus, Georgia, Mr. Watson went to California but a very short time previous to the election there, carrying with him two negro slaves, whom he yet holds as such, we believe.—*Montgomery [Ala.] Gazette & Advertizer*.

——AN OFFER TO SELL SLAVES FOR EMANCIPATION.—We have received the following from a South Carolina planter, whose name and references are with us:

"In order to send my negroes (about twenty-two or twenty-three in number, and mostly young,) to Liberia, I, who am not wealthy, will give up one-tenth of their value, provided you who read this (and many of you are wealthy) will, by combining and paying less than I do, make up to me the remaining nine-tenths; the negroes to be valued by two persons, one to be chosen by ourselves, or the Colonization Society, the other by myself. They will be given up to the Colonization Society to whom any contributions for this matter may be sent.

A SOUTH CAROLINIAN.

——ALARM IN CUBA.—A Correspondent of the *Express* writes from Cardenas under date of March 16, as follows:

From Cape Antonio to Point de Maysi the greatest vigilance is exercised, and from those extreme points daily communications are received by the Governor. All through and around are Government spies in concert, and to judge their motions and agitations, the enactment of a terrible conflict is apprehended. The soldiery, beyond a doubt, are inoculated with the *Independence Small Pox*, which to the Governor's knowledge has become quite contagious. All planters are, under pain of expulsion, commanded to return within 30 days, and to continue doing so the first Friday of every month, the number, accompanied with age and size, of all the slaves in their possession; which goes to prove, in case of an outbreak, their liberation is certain. That the projectors of the Revolution have ample funds at command is beyond all question of doubt, and equally doubtless is the certainty that the days of Royal sway in Cuba are numbered. Yours, &c. V. G. P.

——THE BOY T. H. SAFFORD.—This remarkable mathematical genius, who has attracted so much attention by the early development of his peculiar powers, is made the subject of remark by Professor Pierce, of Harvard College, in his report to the Visiting Committee of the Lawrence Scientific School. Safford attended the Professor's lectures on Analytical Mechanics, and showed himself perfectly competent to master this difficult subject of research. Up to this time he fully realizes his early promise of extraordinary powers as a geometer, but his friends notice with alarm that his body does not keep pace in growth with his intellect, and that he is not gaining that robust health so necessary to a strong mind. It will be remembered that he is under the charge of Edward Everett and Professor Pierce, and is supported by the liberality of gentlemen in Boston.

——MOBBING A TEMPERANCE LECTURER.—There was a good deal of excitement in Quincy, Ill. and Hannibal, Mo. last week, growing out of the attempt of A. Mr. Ross to deliver temperance lectures. He succeeded in his efforts at Quincy, and was sustained by the people; but at Hannibal there was great uproar and confusion for some time, and his friends, although much the most numerous, were compelled to give way. The sellers of liquor, it is said, took the lead in bringing on the excitement.—*Louisville Courier*.

——A fellow has been passing himself off to different individuals in Boston successively, as the son of Mr. Jervis, water commissioner, of New York: of Professor Henry, of Virginia; of Chancellor Kent; and of the president of the New York antiquarian society. He pretended to want money to take him to New York, and succeeded in relieving one of the water commissioners of $10, a Harvard professor of $10, and a benevolent gentlemen of Beacon street of $20.

——GEN. SANTA ANA, who has been residing for some months past near the city of Kingston, has left for Carthagena. In announcing this fact, the *Jamacia Journal* says:

"General Santa Ana will certainly leave this island for Carthagena, where he intends to retire into private life, but that he contemplates interfering again in the affairs of Mexico, is far from his intention. He would still continue his residence in this island, but being a foreigner, unacquainted with the English language, and unaccustomed to the retired life of persons in this country, he is compelled, as it were, to estrange himself from society. A residence in a foreign place like Carthagenia, will be therefore more in accordance with his usual manner of living, and it is for this cause, and none other, that he has made up his mind to leave Jamaica, and make Carthagena his abode."

——THE WESLEYAN METHODISTS IN NORTH CAROLINA.—This denomination makes Slaveholding, or an apology for Slavery a qualification for membership. Within a few years however they have organized societies and are sustaining preachers in some of the slave States. One of their preachers recently informed Mr. Malsck, the publishing agent of the connection in this City, that they have now to contend with the organized opposition of manufacturing companies, by formal resolutions adopted at a stockholders meeting and published in the papers.

We have seen a copy of those resolutions adopted by the Randolph Company—Hugh McCain, President; A. S. H Horney, Secretary—which were approved by the Island Ford Co. of Franklinville, N. C.

They denounce preachers as "mischievous tools of a mercenary agent," aiming at "the creation of horrors and calamities upon which fanaticism may glut and feast." In all which they only aim to redeem the village from reproach and prevent loss to the company. And the preachers affirm that they have "dismissed some hands charged only with countenancing them by going to hear them preach."

——AS IT SHOULD BE.—The Disunionists at the North, are denouncing Mr. Webster, for his recent speech; and in Boston, they have called a meeting for the purpose, to be held in Faneuil Hall this evening. The call is signed by the following persons who recently petitioned the legislature of Massachusetts, to take steph for a disolution of the Union, and as having been open and avowed Diselutionists for years. Henry Wilson, may be remembered by some as a person who made himself so ridiculous at the Philadelphia Convention. The censure of such men is the highest praise:

Samuel G. Howe,	Edmund Jackson,
Wendell Phillips,	Charles F. Hovey,
Henry Wilson,	William L. Bowditch,
Francis Jackson,	Wm. Lloyd Garrison.
Samuel E. Sewall,	Robert Morris."

——MEETING IN FANEUIL HALL.—The meeting in Faneuil Hall last evening, to denounce the speech of Daniel Webster, was largely attended by people of both colors. It was called to order by Francis Jackson, Esq. who announced the following officers: Samuel E. Sewall, President; Messrs. Jackson, Bowditch and French, Vice Presidents, and Messrs. White and May, Secretaries. The objects of the meeting being stated by the President, a letter from the Hon. Charles Francis Adams was read. Rev. Theodore Parker then addressed the assembly for upwards of an hour and a half, in a speech generally denunciatory of Webster and the views expressed by him. In the course of his observations he styled the Massachusetts Senator the Benedict Arnold of the age. At the conclusion, he offered a series of resolutions, in which the speech was denounced as "not fit to be made." Wendell Phillips, Esq., followed after him in the same track, with perhaps a little more enthusiasm and rhetorical finish. He spoke of Webster as "a traitor to the Constitution and an apostate to humanity." He had not finished when we left the hall, quarter before ten.

The *Boston Advertiser* says:

"The list of names subscribed to the call of this meeting was highly significant to Boston people, although those names may not have worried their way to the same notoriety elsewhere. It is almost enough to say they are almost identical with the names of those who were influential at a recent meeting, in advocating and causing to be passed, a resolution calling for *the immediate dissolution of the Union*.

It is not to be wondered at that those persons have no sympathy with the recent course of Mr. Webster.—He stands upon the broad national ground, the defence of which has been the characteristic that has distinguished his policy through his whole life, on the theory that constitutional rights imply constitutional duties. To use his own words, he abjures "that miserable sentiment 'Liberty first and Union afterwards,'" but would stand by 'that noble sentiment—"Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."'—*Boston Post*.—

——COMMODORE STOCKTON'S OPINION.—The Philadelphia *Bulletin* publishes a long letter from Commodore Stockton, which was called forth by the following note from Mr. Webster:

WASHINGTON, March 22, 1850.

MY DEAR SIR: I send to you, as an old friend, a copy of my late speech in the Senate. It relates to a subject quite interesting to the country, as connected with the question of proper governments for those new Territories which you had an important agency in bringing under the power of the United States.

I would hardly ask your opinion of the general sentiments of the speech, although I know you are a very competent judge; that, being out of the strife of politics, your judgment is not likely to be biased, and that you have as great a stake as any man in the preservation of the Union, and the maintenance of the government on its true principles. I am, dear sir, with great respect, yours,

DANIEL WEBSTER.

Commodore STOCKTON.

Commodore Stockton's reply fills nearly four and a half columns. He reprobates with a master spirit, the interference of the Abolitionists with her peculiar institutions. He recommends, in the strongest terms, the non-intervention principle, both in the Territories and in the District of Columbia; and

2. The most efficient act that can be framed to enforce the provisions of the constitution in relation to fugitive slaves.

3. That California, in consideration of the peculiar circumstances of her case, be admitted without the approval or disapproval of that part of her constitution which relates to Slavery.

I believe these three propositions, carried out, would settle the question forever. They involve no concessions, no compromise; they are no temporary expedient. They put the solution of the difficulty upon the eternal principles of right, the law of the constitution.—*Journal of Commerce*

——The long-expected collection of the Literary Remains of Washington Allston, edited by R. H. Dana, Jr., will be published this week by Baker & Scribner. This house has in preparation an edition of the Works of Charles Brockden Brown, with his Life and Correspondence.

——POWER'S STATUE OF CALHOUN.—Recent letters from Hiram Powers informs us that his statue of Mr. Calhoun, ordered some time since for the city of Charleston, is finished. It is possible that it will reach its destination in time to be inaugerated in connection with the funeral solemnities with which Mr. Calhoun's death will probably be celebrated in that city. There are many likenesses of Mr. Calhoun, in marble and upon canvass. The bust by Mr. Mills is faithful, but not a work of genius. One of the best portraits we have seen is by Mr. Kellogg, a painter who long enjoyed the personal friendship of the great Senator. The picture in Brady & Davignon's Gallery (just published) gives a very just impression of his appearance during the last year.—*Tribune*.

——*The Boston Daily Advertiser* contains a letter of commendation addressed to Mr. WEBSTER in reference to his late forcible anti-Wilmot Proviso Speech, and signed by eight hundred influential citizens of Boston and its vicinity, among whose we note the names of Thomas H. Perkins, Wm. Appleton, Postmaster Hayden, O. A. Brownson, Francis Bowen, Hon. Rufus Choate, and most of the heavy merchants and capitalists of the City of Notions. It is a most respectable testimonial.

——The same paper that contains this tribute to Mr. Webster's Speech announces the defeat of the Whig party in Connecticut. The two testimonials seem to about balance each other.

——Edward Everett is engaged upon a History of France, for which he has been many years collecting materials.

——Mr. Prescott has nearly finished his stereotyping his History of Philip the Second, in three volumes, uniform with his other works.

——ADJOURNMENT OF THE LEGISLATURE.—The *Albany Evening Journal* says: "It is probable that the Legislature will adjourn on Wednesday or Thursday of next week. From present appearances the Code will not be acted upon until the next session."

——FROM FLORIDA.—The letter to the *Alexandria (Va.) Gazette*, dated Tampa Bay, East Florida, March 14, says: "The steamer carries off some fourteen more Indians, making with the former detachment, about a hundred men, women and children, for Arkansas. A prospect exists of about the same number to embark from Charlotte Harbor, (Caloose-Hatche) in the course of this month—and then a pause: for the repugnance on the part of the rest, though we suppose diminished by the capture of their comrades, which, of course, has the effect of dampening their hopes of successful resistance or evasion, is still too strong to be readily overcome, even by the potency of gold. By the Fall of the year, probably, the job will be finished.

——RHODE ISLAND ELECTION.—Henry B. Anthony, the worthy Whig Governor of Rhode Island, has been re-elected by a large majority. There was but little opposition.

——FREDERIKA BREMER was in Charleston at the last advices, and we are sorry to learn not in better health than when she left New York.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

For the Standard, from February 1, to March 1, 1850.

531	Eli Belknap, Hopkinson, Mass.	$1 00
520	John Augustus, Boston, Mass.	2 00
506	Philetus Roberts, Staudfordville, N. Y.	1 00
520	Leonard Vincent, Chestnut Ridge, N. Y.	1 00
482	James Piercy, Fowlers Mills, O.	2 00
531	James C. Brown, Xenia, O.	1 00
531	George F. Talbot, East Machias, Me.	1 00
543	Charles Spalding, Lockport, N. Y.	2 00
557	E. H. Hervey, Palenville, N. Y.	2 00
557	B. Snaler, "	2 00
557	James Blanchard, "	2 00
557	Wm. W. Everett, Walden, "	2 00
557	J. P. Rouse, Leeds, "	2 00
557	John Kevlin, " "	2 00
557	Edward Bailey, " "	2 00
557	O. M. Swart, " "	2 00
557	E. M. Spicer, " "	2 00
557	Sidney Wilbur, " "	2 00
557	Samuel Harris, " "	2 00
531	William Schuneman, jr. Catskill, N. Y.	1 00
557	Elizabeth A. Cotton, Boston, Mass.	2 00
505	Lewis Bullard, "	1 75
541	Frederick Hower, Richmond, Ia.	2 00
505	Edwin Cook, "	3 00
544	Richard Marriott, Standfordville, N. Y.	2 00
541	Calvin Brainard, Rochester, N. Y.	2 00
524	Seth Pepper, Sherman, Conn.	1 00
520	Stephen Watrous, Mystic, Conn.	2

Miscellany.

Some of our readers will be amused, some perhaps, shocked, all certainly edified, on a perusal of the following articles which we find under the head of 'Religious Intelligence' in that excellent Journal, the (London) *Inquirer*. As it has long been considered a settled thing that heretics of all sorts shall hereafter find their portion in the Lake that never ceases burning, so it is well that they should understand the orthodox doctrine now to be, at least in England, that neither have they any happiness in this life, however they may be persuaded to the contrary:

EDITORSHIP OF THE ECLECTIC REVIEW.

A warm dispute has commenced among the Congregational Dissenters respecting the new editorship of the "*Eclectic Review*." It appears that a notice of Mr. Gilfillan's "portrait" of Emerson which appeared in the last number of the "*Eclectic*," is considered on some points heterodox; whereupon the Rev. Dr. Campbell, editor of the *British Banner*, instituted inquiries as to the identity of the new Editor. He thus reports the result in last week's paper: "When the *Eclectic Review* changed hands, it was generally reported that the new Editor was a young Minister of the Baptist Body, whose health and voice had impeded his success as a preacher; and that, being a man of superior ability and eminent scholarship, he was henceforth to devote his energies to literature and the *Eclectic Review*—a representation which at once inspired confidence in many quarters, and everywhere prevented the slightest suspicion; but it now comes out that this gentleman was colleague to Mr. W. J. Fox, M. P., the celebrated Unitarian Minister." To the *British Banner* of this week, Dr. Price, the late respected Editor of the *Review*, sends a reply, only extracts from which (as in the case of his attack on Mr. W. Lloyd Garrison) Dr. Campbell thinks proper to insert. Dr. Price states that the "copyright of the *Eclectic* should have been put into the fire rather than have been passed, for a pecuniary consideration, to a man who did not, as I believed and do still believe, cordially embrace the great radical doctrines of the mediatorial economy," —and adds "that my successor was ever a *colleague* of Mr. Fox is untrue, and I charge you, Mr. Editor, with great disingenuousness in having so designated him. The *animus* of the epithet cannot be mistaken; but leaving this, the sentence in question is one of the most marked and glaring instances of the *suppressio veri* which has ever come under my notice. Truth, with the exception just stated, is so put as to produce all the effect of falsehood. The sentence was penned, I doubt not, in haste; but you ought to have inquired, and had you done so, you would have been guiltless of the wrong you have perpetrated. It will be for my successor to make what disclosures he pleases respecting his religious history. I will merely say that though formerly a Unitarian minister, he has learnt a holier truth than Unitarianism teaches, and now glories like the Apostle 'in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ.' The fact of his former Unitarianism, so far from unfitting him for his present post, is one of his many qualifications for it, and as such was present to my mind in November last, when in my closing address I spoke of him as possessing, in some departments, 'more thorough and practical knowledge' than myself. I then anticipated from him, and I do still, such an unfolding of the more latent forms of unbelief, such a development of the struggles of an earnest mind in pursuit of truth, as can be furnished only by those who have been entangled in error, and as would be highly conducive to these anticipations; and, if not, what must be thought of the pious horror you have avowed, and the unworthy insinuation you have ventured to pen! Instead of saying that the present Editor had been a colleague of Mr. Fox, which he never was, you should have said, that though formerly a Unitarian Minister, he had been alarmed by the spread of rationalism in the Unitarian body, and as the only safe resting-place to an inquiring, anxious spirit, had returned to a cordial faith in the doctrine of atonement."

Dr. Campbell, notwithstanding this, thinks there is sufficient cause for "Zion's Watchmen" to be alarmed. "The ex-Unitarian Minister," he says, "has now become Editor of an Orthodox journal, without a word being given to the public of his history, conversion, or claims to the confidence of Evangelical Christians. Was this decent? was it politic? was it just either to the Contributors or the Subscribers to the *Review*? Dr. Price tells us we ought to have said thus and thus. The answer is, Why were we not told thus and thus? What means have been taken to apprize us or the public of the facts? In what way has the fact of the gentleman's change of opinions been made known? In what form has he made his recantation? Has he become associated with any Orthodox Community? If so, was there any service, or ceremony, at his reception? *Was the fact gazetted in the usual channels?* Has he published any account of his renunciation of the deadly dogmas of Socinianism? We have heard of no such things. Where shall we find the record of his present views? We maintain, that these are matters on which the public have a right to be satisfied."

The number of the *Eclectic* just out contains a letter from the new editor, in which he says:—"For my own part, I have simply to state, that the assertion, that I ever was the COLLEAGUE of Mr. W. J. Fox, M. P., *is untrue*; and that though, in by-gone years, I may have entertained and advocated theological views at variance with what are *now* my convictions of Christian truth, I cannot admit that my past errors of opinion can be said to justify any attempt which may be made to damage my interests as editor of the *Eclectic Review*. I allow, candidly and unequivocally, that I have, in former years, entertained and advocated Unitarian sentiments. I allow, *as* candidly and unequivocally, that experience, matured thought, I humbly hope, the Divine Spirit, have led me to discover the error of, and to renounce, such sentiments, and to apprehend, in all its force and sanctifying grandeur, the significance of the declaration made by Jesus Christ to a world which had wandered from duty and from God, that "God so loved the world, that he gave his Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life."

WHAT IS ORTHODOXY?

The paragraph in the article on the *Eclectic* above alluded to, which has caused the charge of infidelity to be made by the *British Banner*, is as follows:—"Mr. Gilfillan says that Emerson 'is not a happy man.' On these words the writer in the *Eclectic* thus comments:—'We protest—in the name of religious liberty, in the name of Christian charity, in the name of even common decency—against all such fierce and insulting soothsayings as this. "Judge not, that ye be not judged." We dissent from Emerson's theory of things, whether latent or spoken, as decidedly as Mr. Gilfillan can do; but we believe the American transcendentalist to be one of the very happiest of Nature's dear children—a belief which is grounded on much observation of him while in this country two years ago. Beside, it is surely a new and heretical doctrine in Christianity, that a man's happiness has anything to do with his nearness to God! Suppose a case of total spiritual death, where there were health, good fortune, great talents, fine morals, noble reputation, everything one could desire; might not the possessor be happier than David with his everlasting struggle, Paul with his boundless sorrow over Jew and Gentile, Dante, or poor Cowper?'"

This the *Banner* declares is "impious;" the very "sound of the words will make the ears of all true Christians to tingle, and the very sight of them will make the eyes of the deaf to flash fire." The writer of the article, the Rev. S. Brown, replies in the following number. He says:—"Nay, now that the passage has been written, printed, published, and condemned by you, I cannot perceive that it is heterodox—even in its leaning, in the slightest degree; else I would recall it. Now, Sir, being a grandson of John Brown, of Haddington, having been industriously and prayerfully trained by a father remarkable among laymen for his knowledge of the Gospel, having sat many years under the ministry of the Rev. Joseph Young, of Haddington (a man distinguished among Scottish pastors for the scientific accuracy of his statements of Evangelical Christianity) —having likewise enjoyed the ministrations of the late Dr. Peddie, of Edinburgh,—having lived in intimacy with the late Dr. Chalmers, corresponding familiarly with the venerable Archdeacon Hare, and habitually living in free converse with many ministers belonging to the Kirk of Scotland, to the United Presbyterian Church, and to the Free Kirk of my native province—I must possess, at least, an intellectual perception of what it is that constitutes evangelical orthodoxy. I claim no more; but you must grant me that much, unless you suppose me to be (intellectually) a fool, and I can defy you to suppose me such."

The *Banner* reiterates the charge of impiety, and adds [the italics, &c. are its own]:—"We say again, far from us, and far from our home, and the homes of our friends, be the lessons of the man who affirms, '*it is surely a new and heretical doctrine in Christianity that a man's happiness has anything to do with his* NEARNESS TO GOD!' If not on God, it must on Satan!"

FABLE OF THE LIONS AND THE ASSES.

Once upon a time the smaller beasts were set upon by the larger ones, and were in danger of being destroyed. Whereupon a council of all the beasts was held for their mutual safety. When the lions saw the great concourse of all beastdom, their hearts failed them, and they meekly joined the council.—But the fox, seeing the tyrants of the forest turned philanthropists, suspected treachery, and slipped away; the more sensible beasts followed his example, till none were left but the lions and the asses, who were wonderfully taken with the magnanimity of the masters of the woods. The lions then proposed that an alliance should be entered into between the lions and the asses for their mutual protection, and the vindication of the rights of all the beasts of the forest. To this the asses gladly assented; but their joy was somewhat abated when the lions reserved to themselves the right of eating the buffaloes, as they were an ugly race of beasts, with very peculiar hair about their heads, which made it plain that nature had marked them for ruin. The asses looked grave, the force of the reasoning not being apparent; besides, if they felt no great remorse of conscience, they could not suppress some sensations of shame for the inconsistency of their profession and act. The council was about to be dissolved, without any satisfactory result, when an old lion renewed his professions of philanthropy, and concluded by saying, that inasmuch as the asses lived in a cold climate, they were entitled to all the skins of the buffaloes for clothing. With this concession the consciences of the asses were quieted. It was further agreed: that if a buffalo escapes north into the pastures of the asses, that he should be returned to be eaten by the lions; but when an ass venture south into the domains of the lions, he was also to be eaten, under the pretence that he was interfering with the buffaloes, and making them a less easy prey to the lions.

This went hard with the kindred and friends of asses who were eaten, for they could not well perceive the advantage of being destroyed by lions rather than by other beasts; but the chief asses, who had monopolized all the skins, laid back their long ears and talked loudly of "THE GLORIOUS UNION."

By and by it came to pass, that notwithstanding the number of buffaloes eaten, they greatly increased; so much so as to endanger the safety of the lions. And the lions were sorely afraid; for wrong can make cowards even of lions! And the lions said to themselves, there are immense pastures west, owned by the deer; let us make war and take them. But lest the beasts may unite against us, let us pick a quarrel with the deer; and, as in the old story of the wolf and the lamb, we will swear that they "muddied the water."

And they made war upon the deer, and many asses and some lions were slain; but the deer were driven off, and the land was taken. Now there was a controversy as to who should occupy the new conquests, the lions and the buffaloes, or the asses: and a great council was again held. The lions contended that they had a right to occupy the common lands with their property, the buffaloes; that the buffaloes were as good as asses; at least, that large portion of them who made the skins into clothing for the chief asses. The asses rejoined; the admission of the one was the exclusion of the other; that the buffaloes could live upon short grass and fare that would turn the stomach of an ass; and besides, the insolence of lions was insufferable, even by an ass. The lions had already claimed immense pastures, bought by common blood and treasure, and the working asses began already to weary of an alliance which brought nothing but burthens and blows and insults.

The lions appealed to the bowels of compassion of the asses; the buffaloes were getting too numerous for safety: their feeding grounds must be enlarged, or buffalodom must come to an end.

The asses did not care; it was wrong to eat buffaloes. *The lions:* it is right. *The asses:* it is a curse. *The lions:* it is a blessing. *The asses:* it shall not extend. *The lions:* it shall. *The lions:* it shall live. *The asses:* it shall die.

The war of words waxed warm; blows were threatened, and "THE UNION WAS IN DANGER."

Now there was one old lion, who was not as fortunate as one who runs with the hare and holds with the hounds. Each side claimed him for a friend. In medicine he would have been considered an empiric, and classed with that portion of the profession called "steam doctors," who treat all diseases as only skin deep. He either did not see the germs of disease lying deep in the constitution, or he had not the will or the nerve to apply the necessary though painful remedy. In plain old times, he would have been called a "trimmer;" in the more polite language of the moderns he was dubbed "the great Compromise." For he had before played political doctor to this same disease.

He was rather severe upon his northern friends, and spoke depreciatingly of some faint show of manliness, particularly in Massachusetts, the particulars of which he condescended indistinctly to remember, but which he thought was hardly becoming in Asses. The south had "heated the poker," and since the north unhappily would not, as usual, suffer it to to be run into them, they murt pay for the heating." With this view he awarded the South a tract of land, indefinite in boundary, but probably as large in result as all that portion of Assdom in which the skins were manufactured. The South, in addition, were to hold all they had, and get all they could, and hold that, and then get more. As an offset, it was conceded to the asses, that the lions would not probably take more than they could get!

This was conclusive. One terrific braying went up, throughout all assdom, "THE UNION IS SAVED."

The buffaloes were returned with renewed zeal to the South to be eaten. And the asses who went down South were eaten. And the asses who remained in the North were, after a while, also eaten.

MORAL.—The ostrich thrusts its head into the sand and imagines itself safe. If the ass walks into danger with his eyes open, it must be remembered that the ass is by nature the bigger fool. The moral of the story will be better seen hereafter.—*Evening Post.*

A GEOGRAPHICAL STUDY.

The people of this country have been recently edified by an American project for connecting New York and the Isle of Wight by a submarine electric telegraph. Perhaps some of our readers experienced a little jealousy at this signal display of enterprise and daring on the part of our brethren in the States. If so, we can easily restore their equanimity, for we assure them that no scheme ever yet conceived, either at Washington or New Orleans, makes any approximation in grandeur or audacity to a well-considered and elaborate prospectus now lying before us. The object of this plan is, to be sure, nothing more nor less than a simple line of railway, but this line is to connect, by a direct and permanent way, the two stations of Calais and Mooltan.

Allowing a few minutes for the subsidence of the incredulity and bewilderment which such a proposal will create, even in minds familiarized with the expansibility of trunk lines, and the intrepidity of projectors, we may proceed to make the scheme a little more comprehensible. Difficulties, it is said, vanish when you close with them, and perhaps some of those already rising in the reader's mind may wear a less formidable aspect when contemplated from a nearer point of view. In point of fact, the distance between England and India is of a very fabulous and artificial character. It used to be called 10,000 to 12,000, or even 15,000 miles. The time consumed in traversing it has varied from nine months to three. Sir Arthur Wellesley modestly stipulated for *four*, as the limit of the period within which there should be always a steady and constant communication between Portsmouth and Calcutta. At the present time the journey from Bombay to Southampton is usually performed in some 35 or 40 days, and there seems to be abundance of room for still further shortening the transit. For, after all, when we look at the plain facts of the case, India is only some few hundred miles further from us than the United States, though we have come to consider the latter country as lying at our doors, while we still regard the former as one of the uttermost parts of the earth. From Spithead to New York it is 2,820 miles; from Ostend to Hyderabad, on the Indus, it is only 3,805.

Most certainly nobody has ever yet looked upon one of these journeys as being only 900 miles longer than the other; but if the "Direct Calais and Mooltan" ever comes into operation, the longer will become actually the shorter of the two. Now, let us look at the several stages of this very edifying journey. In the first place, instead of starting from Calais or Ostend, we may start from Vienna, for up to that point railway communication may be considered as already complete. From Vienna the line is, or was, actually open to Pesth, but here we are stopped, and the next step, therefore, is to carry it as directly as possible to Constantinople. For this purpose it is projected to take a due southward course from Pesth, through the valley between the Theiss and the Danube, crossing the latter river a little below the junction of the Drave, and entering the European territories of Turkey just by Belgrade. From this point to Constantinople intervenes a distance of about 500 miles, over which the line will run along the valley of the Danube, pretty nearly to Nicopolis, when it will make a southward bend to cut the Balkan, apparently by a pass of its own, a little northwest of Eskisara. After this the course through Adrianople to the Bosphorus is clear enough, and so we stand at length on the borders of Europe and Asia, with about one third of the whole journey accomplished, and 2,400 miles still remaining before us—a longish stage, certainly, but not longer than will be in actual operation in the United States before five years are out.

Turkey in Asia is now to be traversed from angle to angle—from Scutari to Basra—saying nothing, for the present, about the Straits. The line will pass over the memorable field of Angora, the scene of Bajazet's defeat, and will then shoot with the straightness of an arrow between the Euphrates and the Tigris—the ancient regions of Mesopotamia. The ruins and relics of Nineveh will be brought close to hand. Babylon and Bagdad cannot fail of being attractive stations, even for those who stop short of Susa and Ecbatana; and, before we have well recovered from the sensations occasioned by the scenery, we shall find ourselves on the coast of the Persian Gulf, about 2,800 miles from our starting port in the Channel. For the last 200 leagues the road will have lain through antediluvian cities, cyclopean remains, gigantic sculptures, mysterious excavations, bituminous lakes, and mosaic wells; and we may reasonably pause for a few moments before we turn our theodolities upon tracts which the most enterprising travellers have yet but imperfectly explored.

We have now two routes open to us. We may either take the great Desert of Kirman, and the wilds of Western Affghanistan, driving right through the Solyman range of mountains, and striking our Indian territories pretty high up in the Punjab; or we may skirt the south western coast of Persia, run exactly through the centre of Beloochistan, and debouch directly upon the old capital of the Ameers of Scinde. Our surveys, traffic, calculations, &c., are here mainly confined to certain statistics respecting the capacities of loaded camels and the tracks of periodical caravans; but the project before us prudently decides in favor of the latter-mentioned route; and the line accordingly, passing right through the ruins of Persepolis, cuts the Belochee frontier at its middle point, and then, turning a little southward, skirts the whole length of the sea-coast under the hills, and at length crosses the Indus a little below Meeanee. The distance traversed in these two stages is about 550 miles in Persia, and as nearly as possible the same in Beloochistan. Perhaps, at this point, it may be advisable to mention, for general information, that Beloochistan is a country bounded on the north by Affghanistan, on the west and east by Persia and Scinde, and on the south by the Arabian sea, and tenanted by an indefinable race, living under no describable government. If, after this, we cannot snap our finger at the Yankees, it will, as they express it, "be a pity."

Yet the total estimated cost of this miraculous design is only £34,050,000—a sum which might indeed have appeared considerable to Adam Smith, but which is a mere trifle according to present notions, and which, in fact, scarcely exceeds what has been actually spent upon two domestic railways. The total annual interest on the capital is under £2,000,000 and the portion which, according to the terms of the project, would have to be defrayed by the "Government" of Beloochistan is only £275,000. We should like, however, to hear Sir Charles Napier's opinion upon the amenability of this interesting population to proper instruction upon the points of international intercourse, free trade, Cabinet loans, and funded debt; nor can we persuade ourselves that the apparition of the projected causeway would be unaccompanied with a certain degree of abruptness in some of the districts of Persia and Asia Minor. "Engineering difficulties," we are well aware, have now no place in a projector's vocabularly, nor is it fit they should have; but there are other not unimportant considerations in the case of a scheme like this. However, we have at last fairly beaten the Americans in comprehensive surveys and audacious speculation, and we have abundant reasons for believing that the scheme which we have here detailed has actually been considered for years, has been digested with the aid of all accessible information, and has been devised with no other end than that of promoting great national good.—*London Times.*

A FLOGGING.

—"'Now, men,' he added, 'you all admit the charge; you know the penalty. Strip! Quartermasters, are the gratings rigged?'

"The gratings are square frames of barred woodwork, sometimes placed over the hatch-ways. One of these squares was now laid on the deck, close to the ship's bulwarks, and while the remaining preparations were being made, the master-at-arms assisted the prisoners in removing their jackets and shirts. This done, their shirts were loosely thrown over their shoulders.

"At a sign from the Captain, John, with shameless leer, advanced, and stood passively upon the grating, while the bare-headed old quarter-master, with grey hair streaming in the wind, bound his feet to the cross-bars, and, stretching out his arms over his head, secured them to the hammock-nettings above. He then retreated a little space, standing silent.

"Meanwhile, the boatswain stood solemnly on the other side, with a green bag in his hand, from which, taking four instruments of punishment, he gave one to each of his mates; for a fresh 'cat,' applied by a fresh hand, is the ceremonious privilege according to every man-of-war culprit.

"At another sign from the Captain, the master-at-arms, stepping up, removed the shirt from the prisoner. At this juncture a wave broke across the ship's side, and dashed the spray over his exposed back. But though the air was piercing cold, and the water drenched him, John stood still, without a shudder.

"The Captain's finger was now lifted, and the first boatswain's mate advanced, combing out the nine tails of his *cat* with his hand, and then, sweeping them round his neck, brought them with the whole force of his body upon the mark. Again, and again, and again; and at every blow, higher and higher rose the long, purple bars on the prisoner's back. But he only bowed over his head, and stood still. Meantime, some of the crew whispered among themselves in applause of their ship-mate's nerve; but the greater part were breathlessly silent as the keen scourge hissed through the wintry air, and fell with a cutting, wiry sound upon the mark. One dozen lashes being applied, the man was taken down, and went among the crew with a smile, saying, 'D—n me! it's nothing when you're used to it! Who wants to fight?'

"The next was Antone, the Portuguese. At every blow he surged from side to side, pouring out a torrent of involuntary blasphemies. Never before had he been heard to curse. When cut down, he went among the men, swearing to have the life of the Captain. Of course, this was unheard by the officers.

"Mark, the third prisoner, only cringed and coughed under his punishment. He had some pulmonary complaint. He was off duty for several days after the flogging; but this was partly to be imputed to his extreme mental misery. It was his first scourging, and he felt the insult more than the injury. He became silent and sullen for the rest of the cruise.

"The fourth and last was Peter, the mizen-top lad. He had often boasted that he had never been degraded at the gangway. The day before his cheek had worn its usual red, but now no ghost was whiter. As he was being secured to the gratings, and the shudderings and creepings of his dazzlingly white back were revealed, he turned round his head imploringly; but his weeping entreaties and vows of contrition were of no avail. 'I would not forgive God Almighty!' cried the Captain. The fourth boatswain's-mate advanced, and at the first blow, the boy, shouting '*My God! Oh! my God!*' writhed and leaped so as to displace the gratings, and scatter the nine tails of the scourge all over his person. At the next blow he howled, leaped, and raged in unendurable torture.

"'What are you stopping for, boatswain's-mate?' cried the captain. 'Lay on!' and the whole dozen was applied.

"'I don't care what happens to me now?' wept Peter, going among the crew, with blood-shot eyes, as he put on his shirt. 'I have been flogged once, and they may do it again, if they will. Let them look out for me now!'"—*Melville's 'White Jacket.'*

A CUSTOM-HOUSE INSPECTOR.

The father of the Custom House—the patriarch, not only of this little squad of officials, but, I am bold to say, of the respectable body of tide-waiters all over the United States—was a certain permanent Inspector. He might truly be termed a legitimate son of the revenue system, dyed in the wool, or rather, born in the purple; since his sire, a Revolutionary colonel, and formerly collector of the port, had created an office for him, and appointed him to fill it, at a period of the early ages which few living men can now remember. This Inspector, when I first knew him, was a man of fourscore years, or thereabouts, and certainly one of the most wonderful specimens of winter-green that you would be likely to discover in a lifetime's search. With his florid cheek, his compact figure, smartly arrayed in a bright-buttoned blue coat, his brisk and vigorous step, and his hale and hearty aspect, altogether, he seemed—not young, indeed—but a kind of a new contrivance of Mother Nature in the shape of man, whom age and infirmity had no business to touch. His voice and laugh, which perpetually reëchoed through the Custom House, had nothing of the tremulous quaver and cackle of an old man's utterance; they came strutting out of his lungs like the crow of a cock, or the blast of a clarion. Looking at him merely as an animal,—and there was very little else to look at, he was a most satisfactory object, from the thorough healthfulness and wholesomeness of his system, and his capacity, at that extreme age, to enjoy all, or nearly all, the delights which he had ever aimed at, or conceived of. The careless security of his life in the Custom House, on a regular income, and with but slight and unfrequent apprehensions of removal, had no doubt contributed to make time pass lightly over him. The original and more potent causes, however, lay in the rare perfection of his animal nature, the moderate proportion of intellect, and the very trifling admixture of moral and spiritual ingredients; these latter qualities, indeed, being in barely enough measure to keep the old gentleman from walking on all-fours. He possessed no power of thought, no depth of feeling, no troublesome sensibilities; nothing, in short, but a few common-place instincts which, aided by the cheerful temper that grew inevitably out of his physical well-being, did duty very respectably, and to general acceptance, in lieu of a heart. He had been the husband of three wives, all long since dead; the father of twenty children, most of whom, at every age of childhood or maturity, had likewise returned to dust. Here, one would suppose, might have been sorrow enough to imbue the sunniest disposition through and through with a sable tinge. Not so with our old Inspector! One brief sigh sufficed to carry off the entire burden of these dismal reminiscences. The next moment he was as ready for sport as any unbreeched infant; far readier than the Collector's junior clerk, who, at nineteen years, was much the elder and graver man of the two.

I used to watch and study this patriarchal personage with, I think, livelier curiosity than any other form of humanity there presented to my notice. He was, in truth, a rare phenomenon; so perfect in one point of view; so shallow, so delusive, so impalpable, such an absolute nonentity in every other. My conclusion was that he had no soul, no heart, no mind; nothing, as I have already said, but instincts; and yet, withal, so cunningly had the few materials of his character been put together, that there was no painful perception of deficiency, but, on my part, an entire contentment with what I found in him. It might be difficult—and it was so—to conceive how he should exist hereafter, so earthly and sensuous did he seem; but surely his existence here, admitting that it was to terminate with his last breath, had been not unkindly given; with no higher moral responsibilities than the beasts of the field, but with a larger scope of enjoyment than theirs, and with all their blessed humanity from the dreariness and duskiness of age.

One point, in which he had vastly the advantage over his four-footed brethren, was his ability to recollect the good dinners which it had made no small portion of the happiness of his life to eat. His gourmandism was a highly agreeable trait; and to hear him talk of roast-meat was as appetizing as a pickle or an oyster. As he possessed no higer attribute, and neither sacrificed nor vitiated any spiritual endowment by devoting all his energies and ingenuities to subserve the delight and profit of his maw, it always pleased and satisfied me to hear him expatiate on fish, poultry, and butcher's meat, and the most eligible methods of preparing them for the table. His reminiscences of good cheer, however ancient the date of the actual banquet, seemed to bring the savor of pig or turkey under one's very nostrils. There were flavors on his palate that had lingered there not less than sixty or seventy years, and were still apparently as fresh as that of the mutton-chop which he had just devoured for his breakfast. I have heard him smack his lips over dinners, every guest at which, except himself, had long been food for worms. It was marvellous to observe how the ghosts of bygone meals were continually rising up before him; not in anger or retribution, but as if grateful for his former appreciation, and seeking to reduplicate an endless series of enjoyment, at once shadowy and sensual. A tender-loin of beef, a hind-quarter of veal, a spare-rib of pork, a particular chicken, or a remarkably praiseworthy turkey, which had perhaps adorned his board in the days of the elder Adams, would be remembered; while all the subsequent experience of our race, and all the events that brightened or darkened his individual career, had gone over him with as little permanent effect as the passing breeze. The chief tragic event of the old man's life, so far as I could judge, was his mishap with a certain goose, which lived and died some twenty or forty years ago; a goose of most promising figure, but which, at table, proved so inveterately tough that the carving-knife would make no impression on its carcase; and it could only be divided with an axe and handsaw.

But it is time to quit this sketch; on which, however, I should be glad to dwell at considerably more length, because, of all men whom I have ever known, this individual was fittest to be a Custom-House officer. Most persons, owing to causes which I may not have space to hint at, suffer moral detriment from this peculiar mode of life. The old Inspector was incapable of it, and, were he to continue in office to the end of time, would be just as good as he was then, and sit down to dinner with just as good an appetite.—*Hawthorne's Scarlet Letter.*

BAD SPIRITS ON THE TAP.

Explanation and History of the Mysterious Communion with Spirits; comprehending the Rise and Progress of the Mysterious Noises in Western New York, generally received as spiritual communications. Finn & Rockwell. Auburn: 1850.

This mysterious yellow-covered pamphlet of eighty pages, bearing the above title, was placed in our hands a few weeks since at an hour of the night very near witching time; we read it through; but strange to say awoke the following morning with a fine appetite, and no remembrance of "nightmare."

Few persons are unknowing of the excitement "out west," upon these "Mysterious Noises," because the *Tribune* has a large circulation, and its columns for months past have been quite at the mercy of the Pros-ers and Cons-ers of the mysterious noise clique.

From the above-named pamphlet it would appear that at the classically named town of Arcadia in Western New York, there lived in 1846 a Mr. Weekman, who in the matter of credulity was emphatically a *strong* man. This gentleman is the discoverer of the spirits who have ever since *raph*-sodized so successfully. One evening this very respectable farmer, while in the act of pulling off his boots, heard a knock at the outer door of his cottage. Going to the latter he opened it, and looked out into the darkness of the night very much like Monsieur Tonson, and, like that dramatic character, discovered nobody. He again commenced disrobing, and the knocking was repeated; once more the door was opened; new search made; he ran around the house—but still nobody! And Mr. Weekman retired to bed discomfitted and baffled; no doubt feeling very much like the verdant Bridget on April fool's day, whom some truant urchin of next door has anonymously summoned to answer the bell-pull.

Mr. Weekman was not troubled longer with the rappings, and shortly after his nocturnal interruption moved away; and a Mr. John D. Fox succeeded him as tenant.

When Mr. Fox had lived in Arcadia (Fox and Weekman—Arcades ambo) some six months, the rappings were made manifest to his family. It was in the tempestuous month of March, and with admirable prudence the rappings, avoiding the front door, ensconced themselves inside the house—living upon the floors and in various wardrobes, and keeping the members of the household every night, far into the wee hours, in a state of agitation which must have been more novel than pleasant. Mrs. Fox and the Misses Fox seem to have been endowed in the premises with uncommon courage. Instead of being dismayed or going into hysterics or sending for the doctor, they commenced holding communications with the "raps," which in learned pig fashion rapped affirmatively to the letters of the Alphabet whenever the proper ones were named. By this method of conversation it was discovered that the rappings were those of a murdered pedlar whose lamp of life had been extinguished for the paltry sum of five hundred dollars. The murdered pedlar soon commenced holding a levee, and thousands of the villagers, and neighboring farmers came to tender gaping homage to his industrious manes; for the pedlar quite threw Blitz and the Fakir of Ava *into the shade* by the exactness of his jugglery and the facility (considering the tedious manner of expression employed) with which he told ages.

"These rappings," says the pamphlet before us, with great naivete, "seemed to evince a partiality for, or to manifest themselves more freely in the presence of the two youngest girls" of Mr. Fox's family. Therefore it is not at all wonderful that, shortly afterwards, when the Misses Fox went to Rochester to reside, the rappings followed them into that city of flour barrels and grain. There the rappings became ambitious, and sinking the pedlar, assumed to proceed from such distinguished personages as Swedenborg, Lorenzo Dow, Dr. Galen, Dr. Channing, and John Wesley. But though the pedlar had aspired to the dignity of the theologian and physician it was very evident he possessed only the pedlar's knowledge, for the rappings continued to tell fortunes and to practise jugglery.

From Rochester the rappings migrated to Auburn. Says the pamphlet:—"*the first of its being heard in that city was when the youngest daughter of Mr. Fox visited it.*"

Of course the intimacy existing between the "mysterious noises" and the Fox-ladies attracted attention; and in true American style committees of investigation were appointed to pronounce if collusion existed. The Committees listened, talked in raps, were puzzled, and shook their heads like a Maine Jonathan at one of McAllister's late diablerie soirees, when his watch was pounded to pieces before his eyes, and straightway returned him sound as ever.

And so the matter rests. The Rappists have already become a numerous sect, and loudly proclaim the Millennium at hand. If it is approaching, we fear under favor of these western revelations that, instead of a Millennium where the devil is bound, he is to be loosed and set to teach our citizens a new language—the language of raps, more tedious than Phonography.

Let not our readers suppose that the rappings are those of mechanical agency; oh, no! they are produced (give attention, Drs. Draper and Torrey, Profs. Chilton and Doremus) "by concussion upon the *more refined ingredients* (!) of the atmosphere causing a vibration of the tympanum, and thus addressing the sound of hearing." There's a discovery in Acoustics, to make known which the mystification of a thousand Western Yorkers is but a trifling consideration.

Verily this is an age of *progress;* and by virtue thereof we are in expectation, whenever canal navigation opens, of a visit from the Rappist, be he the murdered pedlar or Lorenzo Dow—of the twain we would prefer Lorenzo. And our expectation is the stronger; because if the spirit has any self-respect he will visit with indignation the Christy Minstrels, who have impiously lampooned his memory in the following conundrum:—"Why is Rochester like a threepeny grocery?" "Because it keeps bad spirits on the tap."—*Literary World.*

FAT MEN.

There is something cordial in a fat man. Everybody likes him, and he likes everybody. Your Ishmaelites, are in truth, a bareboned race; a lank tribe they are, skeleton and bile. Food does a fat man good, it clings to him, it fructifies upon him, he swells nobly out, and fills a generous space in life. He is a living, walking minister of gratitude to the bounty of the earth, and the fulness thereof; an incarnate testimony against the vanities of care; radiant manifestation of the wisdom of good humor. A fat man, therefore, almost in virtue of being a fat man is, *per se*, a popular man; and commonly he deserves his popularity. In a crowded vehicle the fattest man will ever be the most ready to make room. Indeed, he seems half sorry for his size, lest it be in the way of others; but others would not have him less than he is: for his humanity is usually commensurate with his bulk. A fat man has abundance of rich juices. The hinges of his system are well oiled; the springs of his being are noiseless: and so he goes his way rejoicing, in full contentment and placidity. . . . A fat man feels his position solid in the world; he knows that his being is *cognizable;* he knows that he has a marked place in the universe, and that he need take no extraordinary pains to advertise mankind that he is among them; he knows that he is in no danger of being overlooked. Your thin man is uncertain, and therefore he is uneasy. He may vanish any hour into nothing; already he is almost a shadow, and hence it is that he uses such laborious efforts to convince you of his existence; to persuade you that he is actually something: that he is more than a nonentity; that he is a positive substance as his corpulent fellow creature. . . . It really does take a deal of wrong to make one really hate a fat man; and if we are not always so cordial to a thin man as we ought to be, Christian charity should take into account the force of prejudice which we have to overcome against his *thinness.* A fat man is the nearest to that most perfect of figures, a mathematical sphere; a thin man to that most limited of conceivable dimensions, a simple line. A fat man is a being of harmonious volume, and holds relations to the material universe in every direction; a thin man has nothing but length; a thin man in fact, is but the *continuation of a point.*—*Lectures of Henry Giles.*

HOWARD AND BUNYAN.

In other respects, and apart from the accidents of the case, the prison at Bedford was a fitting scene for the inauguration of his philanthropic career. Its walls were already glorified by the long captivity of Bunyan. Seldom does such a combination occur. From that obscure and petty prison proceeded, but at a long interval of time, two of the noblest and most precious works of man—Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, and Howard's labor of charity and love. Here that famous Puritan—a man whom Milton and Cromwell would have loved and honored—was confined for twelve long years, after the restoration of the Stuart dynasty—1660–72—for the high crime and misdemeanor of denying the right divine of kings and hierarchs to govern wrong; and here, he not only conceived, but also wrote, his famous allegory, that true and genuine book—which has perhaps done more for the spread of real piety and religious sentiment in this country, than any other uninspired production;—supporting himself the while, by his industry in the art of making tags and purses; which he, in common with his fellow-captives, was permitted to sell to visitors. Himself a Puritan of the grand and genuine Miltonic stamp, Howard would certainly feel a deep respect and veneration for this prison on Bunyan's account; and here his own efforts and investigations were to begin.

Dental Parasites.—At a meeting of the American Academy, December, 1849, a paper was read by Dr. H. I. Bowditch, on the animal and vegetable parasites infesting the teeth, with the effects of different agents in causing their removal and destruction. Microscopical examinations had been made of the matter deposited on the teeth and gums of more than forty individuals, selected from all classes of society, in every variety of bodily condition, and in nearly every case animal and vegetable parasites in great numbers had been discovered. Of the animal parasites there were three or four species, and of the vegetable one or two. In fact, the only persons whose mouths were found to be completely free from them cleansed their teeth four times daily, using soap once. One or two of these individuals also passed a thread between the teeth to cleanse them more effectually. In all cases the number of the parasites was greater in proportion to the neglect of cleanliness.—*Year Book of Facts.*

Tinkering.—A correspondent of the N. Y. Literary World writing from Boston, relates the following incident:

"The Rev. Dr. Bethune has been preaching and lecturing here to large audiences. A week or two since, he startled the congregation at the Park-street church, by the administration of a reproof to those literary pests, the 'improvers' of hymns, who are to sacred poetry what Nahum Tate was to Shakespeare. At the close of his sermon he gave out Cowper's hymn in five stanzas, commencing—

'There is a fountain filled with blood.'

He finished reading it stopping rather suddenly, and exclaimed in a clear, distinct voice, '*this last stanza is not as Cowper wrote it! As he wrote it, it runs thus,*' upon which he laid down the book and repeated it from memory. '*I should like to know,*' he continued, *who has had the presumption to alter Cowper's poetry! The choir will sing only the first four stanzas of the hymn.*"

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

We (*Hertford Mercury*) are happy to hear that Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, who has been abroad some months for his health, is entirely recovered, and intends returning to England in the spring.

——The crown of St. Stephen, which Kossuth was supposed to have carried off, is now being traced. An Hungarian refugee named Bolink has just been arrested at Constantinople, and several of the jewels belonging to the crown were found in his possession.

——The *London Daily News* states that King Ernest who was present at one of the concerts of Jenny Lind, "has sent to the Swedish nightingale the appropriate gift of a golden goblet filled with ants' eggs—the food of nightingales."

——Steam Communication between Glasgow and New York.—On Thursday the first steamship intended to open the communication direct between Glasgow and New York by steam, was launched.—This is regarded by the commercial people of the west of Scotland as the commencement of a "mighty trade."

——A Highly Respectable "Party."—A person in want of an occupation, and advertising for the same in the *Times*, informs the world, that "The advertiser being highly respectable, no retail business will suit." This gentleman seems to be somewhat less consequential logically than he is personally. His address is given as K.—Should it not have been S N O B.—*Punch.*

——What are Metaphysics?—"The world is becoming very wise and very stupid, nevertheless," said a pretty lady at a fashionable soiree. "What with its logic and metaphysics——" "What are metaphysics?" inquired a younger beauty. "Faith I cannot tell," said the first. "Hoot awa!" exclaimed an elderly Scotch lady, "I'll just tell all aboot it. Twa fools disputen together; he that's listenen dinna ken what he that's speaken about means; and he that's speaken dinna ken what he means himself. *That's Metaphysics.*"

——A Neapolitan correspondent of the *Athenæum*, describing the late eruption of Mount Vesuvius, says, "The mount